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# Plan Cover Page

Local Education Agency Team:

Local Education Agency:

Identify the Local System:

Date Submitted:

Contact Information for Person Submitting Form

Name/Position Title:

Email:

Telephone:

Local Education Agency Implementation Team: Identify the members of the LEA team responsible for the co-development, data input/root cause analysis, co-implementation, and co-evaluation of the LEA’s CCEIS Plan. The goal of this team is to build the systemic awareness and leadership support necessary for organizational change and sustainability. Consider internal and/or external partners necessary to support the design, implementation, and monitoring of the plan, including school/student support representatives, general and/or special education coordinators, school-based administrators and staff, parents/community members, etc.

| **Name** | **Position Title/Agency** |
| --- | --- |
|  | Director of Special Education |
|  | Local Chief Academic Officer  (Assistant Superintendent of Instruction) |
|  | Local Finance Officer/Representative |
|  | Data Manager |
|  | Preschool Coordinator |
|  | Equity Coordinator |
|  | Other: |
|  | Other: |

Provide the proposed frequency of Local Education Agency Implementation Team meetings aligned with the SFY 2025 implementation timeline.

# Reserved Funds

In accordance with [34 CFR §300.646](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-34/subtitle-B/chapter-III/part-300/subpart-F/subject-group-ECFR4f9a33f19162f53/section-300.646) and federal guidance [Significant Disproportionality (Equity in IDEA) Essential Questions and Answers (March 2017),](https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/significant-disproportionality-qa-03-08-17.pdf) any local system identified as having significant disproportionality must reserve 15% of its federal Part B allocation to provide Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services

(CCEIS), to address root causes of the significant disproportionality. The reserved funds must be calculated based on both the local system’s Part B 611 (611 funds) and Part B 619 (619 funds) total combined passthrough funds. However, a local system retains full flexibility regarding whether the reservation is made with 611 funds, 619 funds, or both. Part B 619 funds reserved for this purpose may be expended for any approved CCEIS activity and are not limited to services for students ages 3 – 5. Table 1 identifies the amounts reserved from each Part B fund source as noted on the SFY 2025 Local Allocation Sheet. The LEA total allocation of 611 and 619 funds and the reserved 611 and 619 funds are prepopulated by the State fiscal liaison.

## Table 1: Allocated Funds

Enter the amount of 611 funds and 619 funds the system will use for the CCEIS plan in the “Local System” section. If the LEA is planning to use amounts that are different from the State’s calculation for the respective 611 funds and 619 funds, the amounts provided must equal the total combined amount of 611 funds + 619 funds.

| **Allocated 611 Passthrough Funds** |  | **Allocated 619 Preschool Funds** |  | **Allocated Total 611 + 619 Funds** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **+** |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **State Calculated 611 CCIS Funds** |  | **State Calculated 619 CCEIS Funds** |  | **State Calculated Total 611 + 619 Funds\*** |
|  | **+** |  | **=** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Local System 611 CCEIS Plan Funds** |  | **Local System 619 CCEIS Plan Funds** |  | **Local CCEIS Plan Total 611 + 619 Funds\*** |
|  | **and/or** |  | **=** |  |

\*Must equal the State Calculated Total above

# Categories of Analysis of Significant Disproportionality

Significant disproportionality is determined based on data patterns over two or more years. The data represented below includes information included in the SFY 2025 Letter of Significant Disproportionality. The LEA must review the data provided, historical trends and recent system data to conduct a programmatic self-assessment and root cause analysis.

Each table is structured to display the specific local system data related to the Category of Analysis / Significant Disproportionality. Data pertinent to at-risk populations for significant disproportionality is included to promote the consideration of proactive, mitigating actions necessary to avoid additional determinations.

## Table 2: Identification Categories and At-Risk Areas Addressed by SFY25 Plan

Directions: For each Category of Analysis of Significant Disproportionality identified in the SFY2025 Letter of Significant Disproportionality, enter Category information, race/ethnicity, risk ratios (21-22 and 22-23), and progress in the table titled, “Area of Significant Disproportionality”. Calculate the risk ratio needed to achieve reasonable progress and enter it into the last column.

For any at-risk area the LEA chooses to address proactively, enter requested data from the SFY2025 Letter of Significant Disproportionality in the table labeled, “At-Risk for Significant Disproportionality”. “At-Risk” is defined as approaching a threshold of 2.00.

Areas of Significant Disproportionality (MUST be addressed with one or more Planned Response Actions – PRAs)

| **Categories of Analysis/Significant Disproportionality - Identification** | **Race/Ethnicity** | **Risk Ratio: 21-22** | **Risk Ration: 22/23** | **Progress** | **Risk Ratio Needed to Achieve Reasonable Progress for 2022-2024** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Select the identification category |  |  |  |  |  |
| Select the identification category |  |  |  |  |  |
| Select the identification category |  |  |  |  |  |
| Select the identification category |  |  |  |  |  |

| **At-Risk for Significant Disproportionality - Identification** | **Race/Ethnicity** | **Risk Ratio: 21-22** | **Risk Ration: 22/23** | **1 Year Change** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Select the identification category |  |  |  |  |
| Select the identification category |  |  |  |  |
| Select the identification category |  |  |  |  |

At-Risk Areas of Significant Disproportionality Proactively Addressed through SFY 2025 CCEIS Plan

## Table 2: Placement Categories and At-Risk Areas Addressed by SFY 2025 Plan

**Directions**: For each Category of Analysis of Significant Disproportionality identified in the SFY2025 Letter of Significant Disproportionality, enter Category information, race/ethnicity, risk ratios (21-22 and 22-23), and progress in the table titled, “Area of Significant Disproportionality”. Calculate the risk ratio needed to achieve reasonable progress and enter it into the last column.

For any area the LEA chooses to address proactively, enter requested data from the SFY2025 Letter of Significant Disproportionality in the table labeled, “At-Risk for Significant Disproportionality”. “At-Risk” is defined as approaching a threshold of 2.00.

| **Categories of Analysis/Significant Disproportionality - Placement** | **Race/Ethnicity** | **Risk Ratio: 21-22** | **Risk Ration: 22/23** | **Progress** | **Risk Ratio Needed to Achieve Reasonable Progress for 2022-2023,  2023-2024** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Select the placement category |  |  |  |  |  |
| Select the placement category |  |  |  |  |  |

Areas of Significant Disproportionality (MUST be addressed with one or more Planned Response Actions – PRAs)

At-Risk Areas of Significant Disproportionality Proactively Addressed through SFY 2025 CCEIS Plan

| **At-Risk for Significant Disproportionality - Placement** | **Race/Ethnicity** | **Risk Ratio: 21-22** | **Risk Ration: 22/23** | **1 Year Change** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Select the placement category |  |  |  |  |
| Select the placement category |  |  |  |  |
| Select the placement category |  |  |  |  |

## Table 2: Disciplinary Removals Categories and At-Risk Areas Addressed by SFY 2025 Plan

For each Category of Analysis of Significant Disproportionality identified in the SFY2025 Letter of Significant Disproportionality, enter Category information, race/ethnicity, risk ratios (21-22 and 22-23), and progress in the table titled, “Area of Significant Disproportionality.” Calculate the risk ratio needed to achieve reasonable progress and enter it into the last column. For any area the LEA chooses to address proactively, enter requested data from the SFY2025 Letter of Significant Disproportionality in the table labeled, “At-Risk for Significant Disproportionality.” “At-Risk” is defined as approaching a threshold of 2.00.

| **Categories of Analysis/Significant Disproportionality – Disciplinary Removal** | **Race/Ethnicity** | **Risk Ratio: 21-22** | **Risk Ration: 22/23** | **Progress** | **Risk Ratio Needed to Achieve Reasonable Progress for 2022-2023** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Select the placement category |  |  |  |  |  |
| Select the placement category |  |  |  |  |  |

Areas of Significant Disproportionality (MUST be addressed with or more Planned Response Actions – PRAs).

At-Risk Areas of Significant Disproportionality Proactively Addressed through SFY 2025 CCEIS Plan

| **At-Risk for Significant Disproportionality - Placement** | **Race/Ethnicity** | **Risk Ratio: 21-22** | **Risk Ration: 22/23** | **1 Year Change** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Select the disciplinary removals category |  |  |  |  |
| Select the disciplinary removals category |  |  |  |  |
| Select the disciplinary removals category |  |  |  |  |
| Select the disciplinary removals category |  |  |  |  |
| Select the disciplinary removals category |  |  |  |  |
| Select the disciplinary removals category |  |  |  |  |

# Programmatic Self-Assessment and Root Cause Analysis

## Self-Assessment and Root Cause Analysis

For each area of identified significant disproportionality (and risk areas, as appropriate), the LEA conducts a review of data from multiple sources to determine patterns, trends, and consider root causes. This data analysis must examine the decision-making processes, procedures, and practices for students ages 3 through 21 with an intentional focus on the impact of Identification, Placement, and Disciplinary Removals on local system trends, patterns, and outcomes. The goal of the analysis is to identify factors contributing to disparate impacts on different racial and ethnic groups. Example data sources include process implementation fidelity data, data highlighting the impact of previously actions to address root causes of significant disproportionality, historical trend data for identification, placement, and/or disciplinary removals, data monitoring students at-risk for identification, placement, or disciplinary removals, etc. Data analysis should include comparison of trends school-, region-, and/or district-wide, and student-specific data should include a comparison across multiple race/ethnicity groups. The DEI/SES Access, Equity, and Progress Specialist, School-Age Performance Specialist, and Early Childhood Performance Specialist provide technical assistance to the local team in compiling data and conducting a self-assessment, including the analysis of preschool data related to Identification and Disciplinary Removals as it relates to the long-term effect on disproportional representation.

MSDE, DEI/SES has provided links to self-assessment resources that may assist the local system’s root cause analysis.

**Directions**: The LEA is required to (a) identify a self-assessment tool recommended by MSDE to support in the root cause analysis process, (b) complete the tool as an LEA team, (c) integrate discussion of the self-assessment results and analysis to guide identification of root causes of significant disproportionality, and (d) include a copy of the results with the CCEIS plan submission. LEAs shall utilize one of the resources linked below.

### [IDEA Data Center – Equity, Inclusion, and Opportunity: How to Address Success Gaps Rubric](https://www.ideadata.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/2017-09/success_gaps_rubric_0.pdf)

According to the IDEA, “This rubric is designed to help any school or school district identify gaps in performance between groups or subgroups of children or students.” This tool is appropriate for determining root causes of all categories of significant disproportionality.

### [Addressing the Root Causes of Disparities in School Discipline](https://spptap.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/15-1547-NCSSLE-Root-Causes-Guide-FINAL02-mb.pdf)

According to Safe and Supportive Learning, “This guide is intended to assist [the]school community in engaging in efforts to create supportive school climates and to address any persistent challenges, including disparities, in the administration of school discipline” This tool is appropriate for determining root causes of disciplinary removals.

### [Assessing and Improving Special Education](https://csti.wested.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/cst-assessing-improving-special-education.pdf)

A Program Review Tool for Schools and Districts Engaged in Rapid School Improvement: According to the Center on School Turnaround at WestEd, “The program review tool is designed to be used by individuals or teams responsible for recommending strategies to improve special education programs.” This tool is appropriate for determining root causes of all categories of significant disproportionality.

## DESCRIBE THE SELF – ASSESSMENT PROCESS AND DATA FINDINGS

This reflective data analysis considers factors within the local system’s control or influence impacting significant disproportionality including inequities related to district and/or school resources; consistent implementation of system policies, procedures, and practices at the district, school, or classroom level; and environmental factors such as trauma, poverty, or access to health and human services.

Contributing root cause factors may include, among other identified factors, a lack of access to evidence-based instruction; economic, cultural, or linguistic barriers to appropriate identification or placement in particular educational settings; inappropriate use of disciplinary removals; lack of access to appropriate diagnostic screenings; differences in academic achievement levels; and/or policies, practices, or procedures that contribute to the significant disproportionality.

**Directions**: Complete a narrative description of the self-assessment process, a summary of the data analysis considered in determination of root causes, contributing factors to significant disproportionality, previous and current interventions to address significant disproportionality and impact. Utilize the CCEIS Self-Assessment Guiding Questions (Appendix A) to ensure all suspected areas impacting significant disproportionality have been considered.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Directions:** Based upon the reflective consideration of the guiding questions, data analysis, and the factors contributing to high rates of identification of the targeted students at this school/region, the following Root Causes factors require intervening action(s) for the Identification, Placement, and/or Disciplinary Removals.

| **ROOT CAUSE(S)** |
| --- |
| Identify the contributing factor(s)/root cause: |
| Identify the contributing factor(s)/root cause: |
| Identify the contributing factor(s)/root cause: |

| **ROOT CAUSE(S)** |
| --- |
| Identify the contributing factor(s)/root cause: |
| Identify the contributing factor(s)/root cause: |
| Identify the contributing factor(s)/root cause: |

## Table 3: Identification – Students with Disabilities and/or Particular Disability - School/Feeder Patterns

As a result of the self-assessment and root cause analysis the LEA is asked to identify the individual school(s) or region(s) within the local system that are the most significantly disproportionate or settings where focused academic/behavioral intervening supports and/or professional development will most likely lead to “reasonable progress”.

In Table 3, use the Guiding Questions linked to EACH category of significant disproportionality (SD) to facilitate analysis and summary of local data trends to identify the root cause by considering factors such as race and culturally based-beliefs, inconsistent implementation of systemic or school-based procedures, and/or access to evidence-based instructional academic or behavioral practices.

Complete Table 3.

**Directions**: Review data from individual schools and/or feeder patterns to determine which schools or groups of schools are contributing to patterns of disproportionality. Schools/feeder patterns should be determined based on multiple data points (including, but not solely, risk ratio) which highlight school- or region-specific factors contributing to significant disproportionality. Note: for Identification, it may be helpful to identify schools with high numbers or rates of recent identifications in the targeted category, as opposed to the total number of students in the category.

| **School(s)/Region(s)** | **Category of Analysis** | **Racial/Ethnic group (targeted as Significant Disproportionate** | **Total enrollment of students in the targeted group with the specific disability** | **Total enrollment of all other students with the specific disability** | **Factors contributing to high rates of identification of targeted students at this school/region** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Select the identification category |  |  |  |  |
|  | Select the identification category |  |  |  |  |
|  | Select the identification category |  |  |  |  |
|  | Select the identification category |  |  |  |  |

## Table 3: Placement – Students with Disabilities and/or Particular Disability - School/Feeder Patterns

In Table 3, use the Guiding Questions linked to EACH category of significant disproportionality (SD) to facilitate analysis and summary of local data trends to identify the root cause by considering factors such as race and culturally based-beliefs, inconsistent implementation of systemic or school-based procedures, and/or access to evidence-based instructional academic or behavioral practices.

Complete Table 3.

**Directions**: Review data from individual schools and/or feeder patterns to determine which schools or groups of schools are contributing to patterns of disproportionality. Schools/feeder patterns should be determined based on multiple data points (including, but not solely, risk ratio) which highlight school- or region-specific factors contributing to significant disproportionality.

Note: for Placement, it may be helpful to review trends related to initial placement considerations and “home”/sending school IEP Team actions related to more restrictive placements/specialized programs.

| **School(s)/Region(s)** | **Category of Analysis** | **Racial/Ethnic group (targeted as Significant Disproportionate)** | **Total enrollment of targeted students in the identified placement** | **Number of all other students in the identified placement** | **Factors contributing to higher rates of restrictive placement of targeted students at this school/region** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Select the placement category |  |  |  |  |
|  | Select the placement category |  |  |  |  |
|  | Select the placement category |  |  |  |  |
|  | Select the placement category |  |  |  |  |

## Table 3: Disciplinary Removals - Students with Disabilities and/or Particular Disability - School/Feeder Patterns

In Table 3, use the Guiding Questions linked to EACH category of significant disproportionality (SD) to facilitate analysis and summary of local data trends to identify the root cause by considering factors such as race and culturally based-beliefs, inconsistent implementation of systemic or school-based procedures, and/or access to evidence-based instructional academic or behavioral practices.

Complete Table 3.

**Directions**: Review data from individual schools and/or feeder patterns to determine which schools or groups of schools are contributing to patterns of disproportionality in disciplinary removals. Schools/feeder patterns should be determined based on multiple data points (including, but not solely, risk ratio) which highlight school- or region-specific factors contributing to significant disproportionality.

| **School(s)/Region(s)** | **Category of Analysis** | **Racial/Ethnic group (targeted as Significant Disproportionate)** | **Total enrollment of students in the targeted group** | **Number of targeted students with disciplinary removals by category** | **Total enrollment of all other students with disabilities** | **Number of all other students with disciplinary removals by category** | **Factors contributing to high rates of disciplinary removals of targeted students at this school/region** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Select the disciplinary removals |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Select the disciplinary removals |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Select the disciplinary removals |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Select the disciplinary removals |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Select the disciplinary removals |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Planned Response Action(s) – (CCEIS)

The Planned Response Action(s) (PRA) describes the specific actions, intervening supports, and capacity-building activities need to target the identified root cause(s) of significant disproportionality. Each PRA includes a projected budget for how the local system will expend the mandatory reserved 611 and 619 funds for CCEIS activities.

Each PRA addresses the impact of root causes on Category(ies) of Analysis and activities must address the following mitigating actions:

Review and/or Adjustments to Policies, Procedures, and/or Practices [required annually per regulations].

Identification of Academic and/or Behavior Interventions implemented as preventative or corrective actions [not identified as an IEP support or service].

Professional Learning for personnel capacity-building focusing on observable changes in the causes of disparate outcomes for students.

As a team, decide how you will address the root cause(s) of disproportionality that you have identified. PRAs should align with the actions/activities identified in Table 3. Types of actions to consider may include:

Professional learning and coaching to improve implementation of supports and interventions;

Professional learning and coaching to address implicit bias, inconsistent decision making, or other factors;

Implementation of academic interventions and supports with targeted students;

Implementation of behavioral interventions and supports with targeted students;

Review and revision of policies and procedures; and

Monitoring of implementation of policies and procedures.

## Key Planning Considerations

Addressing a particular area of disproportionality (e.g., identification, placement, or disciplinary removal) may require more than one planned response action, particularly if there is more than one root cause identified.

In some cases, the same planned response action may address several sub-areas of disproportionality (e.g., in-school and out-of-school suspensions) if the same root cause factors are presented.

Each Category of Analysis or At-risk Area identified must include the review and/or adjustment of policies, procedures, and/or practices.

A separate PRA planning form with a related budget is required.

Discuss with your programmatic and fiscal liaisons allowable actions and costs.

# Planned Response Actions – (CCEIS)

**Directions**: For each planned activity, duplicate the PRA template. Enter the Categories of Analysis (or At-Risk Areas addressed) and Race/Ethnicity Category from Table 2. Identify all aligned root causes from the "Root Causes" box found directly following the Narrative Self-Assessment Description. Determine measurable outcomes, including at least one goal and at least one interim benchmark aligned to grant reporting periods. Goals and benchmarks must include: an expected completion date, an expected measure of progress, and a data source/tool used to measure progress. Goals and benchmarks must also include implementation measures to monitor the impact of all activities outlined in the PRA.

PRA # Category of Analysis

IDENTIFICATION  PLACEMENT  DISCIPLINARY REMOVALS

| **Significant Disproportionality**  **Identify all Categories of Analysis and/or At-Risk Areas addressed by the planned actions outlined in this PRA.** | **Identify the category   Identify the Race/Ethnicity** |
| --- | --- |
| **Root cause**  **Include all aligned root causes identified in the self-assessment section and addressed by the planned actions outlined in this PRA.** | **Identify the contributing factor(s)/root cause.**   **Additional contributing factor(s)/root cause, if applicable** |
| **Measurable Outcome (Reported during interim and final progress reports.) At least one benchmark is required for each reporting period; additional benchmarks may be added as appropriate.** | **Goal** By September 30, 2026:   **Interim Benchmarks** By January 30, 2025:  By January 30, 2026:   By September 30, 2026: |

Identify the CCEIS Plan Part B funding source for this work:  CCEIS 611  CCEIS 619

## Data Source(s)/Methods of Evaluating

| **Data Source(s)/Method(s) for Evaluating – Include both fidelity of implementation and student outcome measures aligned with goals and benchmarks.  Indicate which data points will be included in the mid-year and year-end progress reports.** | **Frequency of Collection and Analysis** | **Completion Date (aligned with goal/benchmark)** | **Staff Responsible for Progress Monitoring** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Directions**: For each goal and interim benchmark, list the data tool/source used to monitor implementation. Indicate the frequency with which the LEA monitoring team will collect and analyze data, the date by which data collection/analysis will end, and the staff responsible for monitoring the data.

**Directions**: For each focus area description, complete the prompts to describe how the activity will address the aligned root causes. A PRA can have as many aligned focus areas as needed. Duplicate the relevant focus area templates (Review and/or Adjustment to Policies, Procedures, and/or Practices, Academic or Behavioral Intervention, and/or Professional Learning) as needed. NOTE: All identified areas of significant disproportionality (or at-risk areas) should be addressed by at least one Review and/or Adjustment to Policies, Procedures, and/or Practices.

| Complete this section for Review and/or Adjustments to Policies, Procedures, and/or Practices | **How does this activity address the root cause(s) identified?**  **What policies, procedures, and/or practices are being targeted?**  **What schools are targeted for this work?**  **What is the intended outcome of revisions to the policies, procedures, and/or practices and the impact on the root cause factor(s)?**  **Who is responsible for implementing this activity?**  **How will the changes be communicated to relevant stakeholders?**  **How will the implementation of the changes be monitored?**  **How will the impact on students be measured?**  **Impact Data:**  **How will the LEA monitor the impact on adult behaviors and/practices including the implementation of policies, procedures, and practices?**  **Schedule of Review:**  **How will the local system communicate/publish the revisions to policies, procedures, and/or practices related to significant disproportionality?**  **Identify the timeline for implementation of this PRA activity.** |
| --- | --- |

| Complete this section for an Academic or Behavior Intervention | **☐ ACADEMIC INTERVENTION ☐ BEHAVIOR INTERVENTION**  **How does the activity address the root cause(s) identified?**  **What is the intervention to be implemented?**  **Which school(s) will be involved?**  **How will students be selected for participation in the intervention?**  **Approximately how many students with disabilities will participate, by race/ethnicity?**  **Approximately how many students without disabilities will participate, by race/ethnicity?**  **Who will implement the intervention?**  **How will the staff implementing the intervention be trained and coached?**  **How will fidelity of implementation be monitored?**  **What student data will be collected and on what schedule?**  **Identify the timeline for implementation of this PRA activity.** |
| --- | --- |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Complete this section for an Academic or Behavior Intervention | **☐ ACADEMIC INTERVENTION ☐ BEHAVIOR INTERVENTION**  **How does the activity address the root cause(s) identified?**  **What is the intervention to be implemented?**  **Which school(s) will be involved?**  **How will students be selected for participation in the intervention?**  **Approximately how many students with disabilities will participate, by race/ethnicity?**  **Approximately how many students without disabilities will participate, by race/ethnicity?**  **Who will implement the intervention?**  **How will the staff implementing the intervention be trained and coached?**  **How will fidelity of implementation be monitored?**  **What student data will be collected and on what schedule?**  **Identify the timeline for implementation of this PRA activity.** |

| **Complete this section for Professional Learning Activities** | **How does the activity address the root cause(s) identified?**  **What is the intended outcome of professional learning and its impact on the root cause factor(s)?**  **Who will participate in professional learning?**  **Role(s) of participant(s) within the selected school/region**.  **Number of participant(s)**:  **Which schools are being identified by this capacity building activity?**  **Why were the above-named schools selected?**  **How will the training be implemented and by whom?**  **Schedule**:  **Format**:  **Duration**:  **Trainer(s):**  **How will coaching be implemented and by whom?**  **Schedule**:  **Format**:  **Duration**:  **Coach(es)**:  **What implementation data will be collected and on what schedule?**  **Implementation Data:**  **Schedule**: |
| --- | --- |

| **Complete this section for Professional Learning Activities** | **How will the impact on students be measured?**  **Impact Data**:  **Schedule of Review**:  **How will the LEA monitor the impact on adult behaviors and/practices because of professional learning and/or coaching?**  **Identify the timeline for implementation of this PRA activity.** |
| --- | --- |

# Budget

Provide detailed information on proposed expenditures such as salary and wages, number of staff persons, types of supplies and materials, and approximate unit cost/quantity to be purchased for each PRA. Please stipulate which funding source will be used (611 or 619).

Double click to enter data. Click outside of the spreadsheet to return to Word controls.

## PRA Excel Budget Document Part B 611



## PRA Excel Budget Document for Part B 619



# Supporting Fiscal Documents and Plan Approvals

The MSDE Financial Reporting Manual for Maryland Public Schools Revised 2014 should be used as a guide for Category and Objective line items. Refer to page 65 through 70 for a detailed description of the objective classifications.

Please submit the following required fiscal documents as part of the LEA’s CCEIS Plan:

[MSDE Grant Budget C-1-25](https://www.marylandpublicschools.org/about/Documents/Grants/GrantForms-12-10-2020.xls): Local systems that have been identified as having significant disproportionality must complete a separate MSDE Grant Budget C-1-25 for the CCEIS grant represented in the local plan and listed on the local system’s allocation sheet. Note: If the LEA chooses to combine the state-calculated allocations (i.e., use all funds in 611 or use all funds in 619), then it is only necessary to submit one MSDE Grant Budget C-1-25. The local system must contact the MSDE, DEI/SES, Resource Management Monitoring Branch (RMMB) before changing the distribution of the state calculated Part B 611 and/or 619 allocations.

Upon approval, a revised SFY 2025 Local Allocation Sheet reflecting the proposed changes will be issued by the MSDE, DEI/SES, RMMB.

[Budget Detail Form](https://www.marylandpublicschools.org/programs/Documents/Special-Ed/rmmb/Grants/Grant%20Documents/SFY%202024/LAFF/FFY2023-SFY2024-LAFF-APP_EXCEL_Budget_Workbk.xls): A separate Budget Detail Form is required for each MSDE Grant Budget C-1-25. The Budget Detail Form captures the detailed expenses for the amounts that appear on the MSDE Grant Budget C-1-25. The Budget Detail Form total must equal the total entered on the MSDE Grant Budget C-1-25. Enter only whole numbers on the Grant Budget C-1-25 and Budget Detail Form.

On the Budget Detail Form, enter:

The grant name/line initiative (may be selected from the drop-down menu);

The Category/Program (refer to the MSDE Grant Budget Form (C-1-25);

The Object (may be selected from the drop-down menu); and

A description of each item. Include a unit cost and the number of units, if applicable, in the description.

## PROGRAMMATIC AND FISCAL PROGRESS REPORTS

January 31, 2025 - Interim Progress/Cumulative Variance Report #1 for all SFY 2025 CCEIS Plans ending September 30, 2026.

January 31, 2026 - Interim Progress/Cumulative Variance Report #2 for all SFY 2025 CCEIS Plans ending September 30, 2026.

August 15, 2026– Grant Amendment Requests for all SFY 2025 CCEIS Plans ending September 30, 2026.

November 30, 2026 - Final Progress/Cumulative Variance Report and Final Financial Report for all SFY 2025 CCEIS Plans ending September 30, 2026.

Fiscal Responsibilities/Use of Funds: The general non-supplant requirement for IDEA funds in 34 CFR §300.202(a)(3) states that funds provided to LEAs under Part B of the IDEA must be used to supplement State, local, and other federal funds and not supplant those funds.

This requirement applies to all Part B funds including any used for CCEIS.

# LEA Signatures Required for Submission

Local Director of Special Education Signature Date

Local Chief Academic Officer (or Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum) Signature Date

Local Finance Officer Signature Date

Local Superintendent (or Deputy Superintendent) Signature Date

## MSDE, DEI/SES SIGNATURES

MSDE, DEI/SES, Equity Specialist Signature Date

MSDE, DEI/SES, Programmatic Liaison Signature Date

MSDE, DEI/SES, Fiscal Liaison Signature Date

MSDE, DEI/SES, Resource Management and Monitoring Branch Chief Signature Date

# Appendix A: CCEIS Plan Self-Assessment Guiding Questions

For EACH category of disproportionality, consider the guiding questions below, the self-assessment tool, and other resources.

## Identification – Students with Disabilities and/or Particular Disability

### Guiding Questions:

What are the patterns of identification by age/grade band and racial/ethnic group? Are there greater disparities at some levels than others? (Note: Although developmental delay is not one of the categories included in CCEIS, it may be helpful to look at comparative rates of identification within that group. LSS may also want to review students changed from DD to another eligibility category to identify any disproportionate patterns.)

What are the patterns of referral to SST over the last several years (system-wide and by school)? Are certain groups of students more likely to be referred for intervention?

What are the patterns of participation in Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions (academic and/or behavioral) or other supports? Is there a consistent and robust system of interventions across schools? Is the fidelity of implementation comparable across schools? Do all groups of students access them equally?

What are the patterns of referral from SST for special education evaluation over the last several years (system-wide and by school)? If some schools evaluate a higher proportion of students and/or some groups of students are evaluated at a higher rate, what is driving these differences? Are there variations in the reason for referral (e.g., behavior, academic, parent concern, etc.) for different groups of students? If so, what may be driving these differences?

What are the patterns of eligibility determination over the last several years (system-wide and by school)? Are students found eligible at a higher rate in some schools than others? Are certain groups of students more likely to be found eligible?

Review the Part C to Part B transition assessments over the last several years. Are certain groups of students likely to be found eligible?

What policies, procedures, and guidance does the system have that impact what disabilities are considered for an individual student, what assessments are used, and how decisions are made? Are they implemented consistently across staff and schools?

## Placement– Students with Disabilities and/or Particular Disability

### Guiding Questions:

What are the patterns of placement in separate classes and/or schools? Do they vary based on different types of classes/programs (e.g., behavior support programs, “life skills” classes, etc.)?

What are the patterns of placement in separate programs/schools by age/grade and/or race? Is disproportionality more evident at some levels (e.g., preschool, elementary, secondary) than others? What factors might be influencing those differences? Are different groups of students more likely to be placed in separate settings at different times (e.g., Part C to Part B transition, elementary to middle school, beginning of high school).

Looking at students who have transitioned into separate placements in the last few years, what patterns by race/ethnicity, age/grade, “sending” school, or other factors are evident? What might be driving these differences?

Does the system have disproportionate rates of participation in the Alternate Framework/Alternate Assessment? How might rates of participation be impacting placements? (Examine the LEA projected participation rates for an alternate assessment in comparison to actual rates.)

What supports, services, and processes are available to support students in participation in general education? Are they consistently available and implemented across schools?

What system-level policies and procedures related to the movement of students in and out of restrictive settings? Are they implemented consistently across schools? Is there anything about these procedures or their implementation that might be contributing to disproportionality?

## Disciplinary Removals – Students with Disabilities and/or Particular Disability

### Guiding Questions

Review the data on office disciplinary referrals by student subgroup, system-wide and by school, including:

* Types of offenses resulting in referral
* Rates of referral by individual student and/or student groups
* Rates of referral by individual teachers

What patterns by race/ethnicity are evident? Are some groups of students more likely to be referred? Are some schools and/or teachers generating comparatively more referrals?

Review the data on patterns of disciplinary removals by student subgroup, system-wide and by school, including:

* Type of offenses resulting in suspension
* Percentage of referrals leading to suspension

What patterns by race/ethnicity are evident? Are some groups of students more likely to be suspended for categories of offenses (e.g., low-level offenses such as disrespect that generally should not lead to removal/suspension). Are some groups of students more likely to be suspended? Are some schools generating comparatively more suspensions?

Are schools, classrooms, programs, etc. generating large numbers of suspensions of students in particular subgroups? What factors are leading to a higher rate of suspension for those students?

What are the patterns of referrals and removals for students in different subgroups at different age/grade levels (e.g., preschool, elementary, middle, high)? Do rates of suspension among groups differ at different levels?

Review the data on disproportionality in suspension for all students in the system, including root cause analysis and improvement measures undertaken.

What are the similarities and differences in patterns for students with disabilities? What additional or different responses are needed to address causes specific to students with disabilities?

What are the patterns of participation in behavior supports, tier two/tier three interventions within and across schools? Do students from different subgroups participate in these interventions at different rates? Is support available and consistently implemented across schools?

What patterns in the development and implementation of behavior intervention plans are evident? Are different groups of students more likely to receive individualized behavior support?