

Mississippi Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 20%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 19%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 66%.</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This means that the State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013.</p> <p>In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, States must use the same data they used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 22%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 24%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 18%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 23%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 33.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 50%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 97.5% for reading and 97.4% for math. The FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 97.7% for reading and 97.6% for math. The State met its FFY 2010 targets of 95%.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>

Mississippi Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[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, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 20% for reading and 29.1% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 19.8% for reading and 28.5% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets of 66.3% for reading and 68.0% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 28.95%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State changed its calculation methodology. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 44 districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported that all districts met the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten students with disabilities enrolled in the district.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b), for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010. The State did not identify noncompliance through this review.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 1.32%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 57 districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State reported that it reviewed the districts’</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>

Mississippi Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>policies, procedures or practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010. The State did not identify noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>The State reported that one of 152 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement that districts with less than ten students with disabilities of the specified race/ethnicity enrolled in the district be excluded from the calculation for that racial ethnic group.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected in a timely manner.</p>																					
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;</p> <p>B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or</p> <p>C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 781 1583 1256"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td align="center">56.39</td> <td align="center">66.97</td> <td align="center">57.97</td> <td align="center">10.58%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">12.11</td> <td align="center">12.89</td> <td align="center">17.48</td> <td align="center">-0.78%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">2.23</td> <td align="center">2.17</td> <td align="center">2.23</td> <td align="center">0.06%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5C from the FFY 2009 data. The State met all of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	56.39	66.97	57.97	10.58%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	12.11	12.89	17.48	-0.78%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.23	2.17	2.23	0.06%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	56.39	66.97	57.97	10.58%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	12.11	12.89	17.48	-0.78%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.23	2.17	2.23	0.06%																		
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p> <p>A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR.</p>	<p>The State must provide FFY 2011 baseline data, an FFY 2012 target, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 in the SPP that</p>																				

Mississippi Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																												
education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. [Results Indicator; New]		it submits with the FFY 2011 APR.																												
7. Percent of preschool children age 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. [Results Indicator]	The State's reported data for this indicator are: <table border="1" data-bbox="548 597 1583 1507"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 597 957 696"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="957 597 1163 696"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 597 1373 696"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 597 1583 696"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 696 957 834">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 696 1163 834">47.4</td> <td data-bbox="1163 696 1373 834">47</td> <td data-bbox="1373 696 1583 834">49</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 834 957 1000">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 834 1163 1000">49.1</td> <td data-bbox="1163 834 1373 1000">47</td> <td data-bbox="1373 834 1583 1000">51</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1000 957 1105">Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 1000 1163 1105">38.1</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1000 1373 1105">43</td> <td data-bbox="1373 1000 1583 1105">40</td> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1105 957 1205"><u>Summary Statement 2</u></th> <th data-bbox="957 1105 1163 1205"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 1105 1373 1205"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 1105 1583 1205"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1205 957 1343">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 1205 1163 1343">80.4</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1205 1373 1343">78</td> <td data-bbox="1373 1205 1583 1343">82</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1343 957 1507">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 1343 1163 1507">68.2</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1343 1373 1507">61</td> <td data-bbox="1373 1343 1583 1507">70</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	47.4	47	49	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	49.1	47	51	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	38.1	43	40	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	80.4	78	82	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	68.2	61	70	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR. The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011 APR.
<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																											
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	47.4	47	49																											
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	49.1	47	51																											
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	38.1	43	40																											
<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																											
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	80.4	78	82																											
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	68.2	61	70																											

Mississippi Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	76.4	72	78	
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. [Results Indicator]	These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State met part of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator. The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 95.79%. The FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 95.86%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 71.46%. In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.				OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.
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. [Compliance Indicator]	The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%. The State reported that seven districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification. The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.” The State reported that one of 152 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten enrolled children with disabilities in any racial/ethnic category.				OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.
10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]	The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%. The State reported that 24 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification. The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”				OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.

Mississippi Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>The State reported that one of 152 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten in a disability category.</p>	
<p>11. 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.09%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 99.03%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 35 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State’s data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (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 completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated</p>

Mississippi Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 93.94%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 97.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 12 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the State is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (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 developed</p>

Mississippi Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.95%. The State's FFY 2009 data were 100% for this indicator. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY</p>

Mississippi Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>or student who has reached the age of majority. [Compliance Indicator]</p>		<p>2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>																				
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>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</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1133 1583 1505"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Enrolled in higher education</td> <td align="center">24</td> <td align="center">24</td> <td align="center">26</td> <td align="center">0.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">61</td> <td align="center">59</td> <td align="center">63</td> <td align="center">-2.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some</td> <td align="center">78</td> <td align="center">77</td> <td align="center">80</td> <td align="center">-1.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Enrolled in higher education	24	24	26	0.00%	B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	61	59	63	-2.00%	C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some	78	77	80	-1.00%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Enrolled in higher education	24	24	26	0.00%																		
B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	61	59	63	-2.00%																		
C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some	78	77	80	-1.00%																		

Mississippi Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed</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 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 77 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner.</p>					<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in timely correcting findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009.</p> <p>When reporting in the FFY 2011 APR on the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010: (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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to</p>

Mississippi Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</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, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012 are 94.12%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State’s FFY 2011 IDEA section 618 data, demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 50%. These data are based on two due process hearings. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p> <p>OSEPs verification visit letter dated February 6, 2012 required the State to provide: (1) procedures that the State will implement to monitor whether LEAs hold a resolution meeting within 15 days of receiving notice of a parent’s due process complaint, unless one of the circumstances in 34 CFR §300.510(a)(3) occur; (2) Documentation that it has revised standard language for memoranda or other guidance to LEAs, parents, and due</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State’s FFY 2011 IDEA section 618 data, demonstrating that it is in compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>

Mississippi Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	process hearing officers to make those documents consistent with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.510(c) and 300.515(a) and (c) regarding the dates on which the resolution period ends and the 45-day timeline for due process hearing decisions begins. The State has provided the required information, no further action is required.	
18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State reported, as of January 31, 2012, that all five resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 50%. The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2010. The State is not required to meet its targets or provide improvement activities in any fiscal year in which fewer than ten resolution sessions were held. Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.
19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State reported, as of January 31, 2012, that five of eight mediations resulted in mediation agreements. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 75%. The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2010. The State is not required to meet its targets or provide improvement activities in any fiscal year in which fewer than ten mediations were held. Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.
20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.
OSEP Verification Visit Issues		
General Supervision System Critical Element 1: Identification of	OSEPs verification visit letter dated February 6, 2012 required the State to provide: (1) (a) The date(s) on which it issued findings of noncompliance to LEAs based on	The State provided the required information and no further action

Mississippi Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
Noncompliance	<p>FFY 2010 data from its database for Indicators 11, 12, and/or 13; and (b) an assurance that in future years it will issue such findings in a timely manner; and</p> <p>(2) (a) A description of the procedures that it has implemented to determine whether any LEAs are conducting district-wide assessments; (b) if so, the number, if any, of LEAs that are conducting such assessments; and (c) the procedures it has implemented (or will implement, with a specific timeline for implementing such procedures) to determine whether any LEAs that are conducting district-wide assessments are doing so in a manner that meets the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.160 and 300.320(a)(6).</p>	is required.