

### Mississippi Part B FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<b>Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE</b>		
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State did not submit FFY 2005 data for this indicator.</p>	<p>The State did not submit FFY 2005 data for this indicator.</p> <p>The State must provide the required data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State did not submit FFY 2005 data for this indicator.</p>	<p>The State did not submit FFY 2005 data for this indicator.</p> <p>The State must provide the required data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported AYP data for this indicator are 57% for Reading/Language Arts (R/LA) and 54% for Math. This represents slippage from the State's FFY 2004 reported data of 96.7% for R/LA and 82.9% for Math. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 targets of 97% for R/LA or 85% for Math.</p>	<p>The State revised its improvement activities for Indicator 3 and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 97%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 95%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards. [Results Indicator]		
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for R/LA are as follows: 3<sup>rd</sup> grade – 58%, 5<sup>th</sup> grade – 43%, and 7<sup>th</sup> grade – 17%. This represents slippage from the State's FFY 2004 reported R/LA data of 62%, 51%, and 24% respectively. The State did not meet its targets for R/LA for 3<sup>rd</sup> grade (66%), 5<sup>th</sup> grade (60%), and 7<sup>th</sup> grade (29%).</p> <p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for Math are as follows: 3<sup>rd</sup> grade – 75%, 5<sup>th</sup> grade – 33%, and 7<sup>th</sup> grade – 15%. These data represent slippage from the State's FFY 2004 reported Math data of 78%, 37%, and 22% respectively. The State met its 3<sup>rd</sup> grade target for Math (71%), but did not meet its FFY 2005 targets for 5<sup>th</sup> grade (36%) or 7<sup>th</sup> grade (18%).</p>	<p>Although the State provided raw data for all grades tested for this indicator in Table 6, the State did not include data for grades 4, 6, 8, and 10 in the APR. The State must include all required data for this indicator in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>With the exception of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade Math, the State reported slippage overall for this indicator. The State should review its improvement activities and revise, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate improved performance for students with disabilities.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 0%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 0%.</p>	<p>The State revised its improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance on this indicator.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]		
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>		<p>Based upon our preliminary review of all State submissions for Indicator 4B, it appears that the instructions for this indicator were not sufficiently clear and, as a result, confusion remains regarding the establishment of measurements and targets that are race-based and for which there is no finding that the significant discrepancy is based on inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. As a result, use of these targets could raise Constitutional concerns. Therefore, OSEP has decided not to review this year's submissions for Indicator 4B for purposes of approval and will revise instructions for this indicator to clarify how this indicator will be used in the future. Based upon this, OSEP did not consider the submissions for Indicator 4B in making determinations under section 616(d). It is also important that States immediately cease using Indicator 4B measurements and targets, unless they are based on a finding of inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p>
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>5A. The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 54.8%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 53.5%.</p> <p>5B. The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 21.9%. This represents slippage from the State's FFY 2004 reported data of 22.5%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 21.4%.</p> <p>5C. The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 1.99%. The State met its</p>	<p>The State revised its improvement activities for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>5A. The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>5B. OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>5C. The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	FFY 2005 target of 2.63%.	
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 71.6%. This represents slippage from the State's FFY 2004 reported data of 78.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 78.6%.</p>	<p>The State revised its improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>Please note that, due to changes in the 618 State-reported data collection, this indicator will change for the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. States will be required to describe how they will collect valid and reliable data to provide baseline and targets in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>Entry data provided.</p>	<p>The State reported the required entry data and activities. The State must provide progress data and improvement activities in the FFY 2006, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>Although not required until the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State provided targets and improvement activities. The State did not include timelines for the improvement activities, and must include timelines for the activities in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State's reported baseline data for this indicator are 61.46%.</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State did not include a copy of the parent survey that was required by the instructions to be included in the February 1, 2007 APR. The State must submit this information in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<b>Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality</b>		
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>The State reported the percentage of districts with disproportionate representation.</p>	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State indicated that, consistent with the <i>Mattie T.</i> December 15, 2003 Consent Decree, the State analyzed the data for two race/ethnicity groups: African-American and All Other Children. Using this analysis, the State</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator; New]		identified districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, but did not determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification, as required by 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3). The State must provide, in its FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, baseline data from FFY 2005 on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how the State made that determination (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures, etc.). The State must also provide data, in its FFY 2006 APR, on the percent of districts identified in FFY 2006 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how the State made that determination, even if the determination occurs in the fall of 2007.
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator; New]</p>	The State did not report any data for this indicator.	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State indicated that, consistent with the <i>Mattie T.</i> December 15, 2003 Consent Decree, the State analyzed the data for two race/ethnicity groups: African-American and All Other Children.</p> <p>The State must provide, in its FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, baseline data from FFY 2005 on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how the State made that determination (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures, etc.). The State must also provide data, in its FFY 2006 APR, on the percent of districts identified in FFY 2006 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how the State made that determination, even if the determination occurs in the fall of 2007.</p>
<b>Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision</b>		
11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days	The State did not provide FFY 2005 baseline data for	The State submitted targets and improvement activities, and OSEP accepts

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>(or State established timeline). [Compliance Indicator; New]</p>	<p>this indicator.</p>	<p>the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State did not submit FFY 2005 data for this indicator. The State indicated that it would have baseline data from FFY 2006 to report in the FFY 2006 APR. The State must provide all required data for this indicator in the FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1).</p>
<p>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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided no FFY 2005 data for this indicator.</p> <p>The State did not address timely correction.</p>	<p>The State revised its improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP's March 21, 2006 FFY 2004 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR, data showing compliance with 34 CFR §300.124(b). In addition, the State was required to include 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 3<sup>rd</sup> birthday.</p> <p>The State provided no FFY 2005 data for this indicator. The State indicated that data would be available later in 2007.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including correction of the noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 and FFY 2005.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals. [Compliance Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State did not submit FFY 2005 baseline data for this indicator.</p>	<p>The State submitted targets and improvement activities, and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State did not submit FFY 2005 data for this indicator. The State indicated that data collection is not planned to begin until the fall of 2007. This will mean that the State will not be able to report data for the FFY 2006 year either. Although it will not excuse the State's failure to report the data required for this indicator for the FFY 2005 or FFY 2006 years, in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must report on how it is ensuring compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.320(b).</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>14. Percent of youth, who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of post-secondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State provided a plan that describes how the data will be collected.</p>	<p>The State provided a plan that describes how data will be collected.</p> <p>The State must provide baseline data, targets, and improvement activities, with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>The State did not provide a narrative defining competitive employment or post-secondary school, as required by the instructions for this indicator. The State must submit this information in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 80.85%. This represents progress from the State's FFY 2004 reported data of 59.5%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State revised its improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State provided data for this indicator indicating 80.85% compliance, but did not break these data down by indicator or substantive finding areas. The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure that they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600. In its response to Indicator 15 in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must disaggregate by APR indicator the status of timely correction of the noncompliance findings identified by the State during FFY 2005. In addition, the State must, in responding to Indicator 12, specifically identify and address any noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2004 or FFY 2005 for this indicator.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State revised its improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported that it met its FFY 2005 target for this indicator, however, the State's data, as reported in Table 7 (13 complaints filed), did not match the data included in the APR narrative (11 complaints filed). The State must ensure that the data it reports for this indicator are the same as the data it reports in Table 7 in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that continue to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.152.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State revised its improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>While the State reported that it met its FFY 2005 target for this indicator, the State's data reported in Table 7 (15 hearing requests) did not match the data included in the APR narrative (22 hearing requests). The State must ensure that the data it reports for this indicator are the same as the data it reports in Table 7 in the FFY 2006 APR due, February 1, 2008.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that continue to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.515(a).</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State reported that it had three hearing requests that went to resolution sessions.</p>	<p>The State is not required to provide baseline, targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which 10 or more resolution meetings were held.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 69.6%. This represents slippage from the State's FFY 2004 reported data of 75%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 75%.</p>	<p>The State revised its improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target for this indicator. In addition, the State's data reported in Table 7 (27 mediation requests) did not match the data included in the APR (25 mediation requests) for this indicator. The State must ensure that the data it reports for this indicator are the same as the data it reports in Table 7 in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate improvement in performance.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%.</p> <p>However, the State did not report FFY 2005 data for Indicators 1, 2, 11, 12, and 13. The State did not meet its</p>	<p>The State revised its improvement activities and targets for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP's March 21, 2006 FFY 2004 SPP response letter required the State to revise its targets for this indicator to clarify that it intends to reach 100% accuracy AND timeliness in reporting data to OSEP and publicly. The State made the required revisions to its targets in the FFY 2006 APR and in the SPP.</p>



<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	FFY 2005 target of 100%.	The State must review its improvement activities, and revise them, as appropriate, to ensure that they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in IDEA section 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).