



Maryland

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Local Education Agency (LEA) Process Guidance for Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CCEIS) Plan Development

FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR (FFY) 2025

STATE FISCAL YEAR (SFY) 2026

Division of Early Intervention and Special Education Services

March 2025

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Carey M. Wright, Ed.D.

Interim State Superintendent of Schools

Tenette Y. Smith, Ed.D.

Deputy State Superintendent
Office of Teaching and Learning

Antoine Hickman, Ed.D.

Assistant State Superintendent
Division of Early Intervention and Special Education Services

Wes Moore

Governor

MARYLAND STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Joshua L. Michael, Ph.D. (President)

Monica Goldson, Ed.D. (Vice President)

Chuen-Chin Bianca Chang, MSN, PNP, RN-BC

Kenny Clash

Clarence C. Crawford (President Emeritus)

Abhiram Gaddam (Student Member)

Susan J. Getty, Ed.D.

Nick Greer

Dr. Irma E. Johnson

Dr. Kim Lewis

Dr. Joan Mele-McCarthy, D.A., CCC-SLP

Rachel L. McCusker

Xiomara V. Medina, M.Ed.

Samir Paul, Esq.

Table of Contents

Process Guidance Overview – SFY26 CCEIS Plan Development	3
Categories of Analysis of Significant Disproportionality	5
Process for Conducting and Completing a Programmatic Self-Assessment and Root Cause Analysis	7
CCEIS Plan Self-Assessment Guiding Questions	10
Development of Planned Response Action(s)	12
Developing CCEIS Plan PRA Focus Area Descriptions	14
Supporting Fiscal Documents and Plan Approvals	21
MSDE Submission Review Look-Fors	23

Process Guidance Overview – SFY26 CCEIS Plan Development

IDEA regulations guiding the mandatory provision of CCEIS require Local Education Agencies (LEAs) identified by the State as having significant disproportionality to reserve 15 percent of IDEA Part B Section 611 and Section 619 funds to implement a comprehensive system of proactive and responsive actions to address root cause factors contributing to significant disproportionality with respect to identification, placement, and/or disciplinary removals. CCEIS is defined by regulations [34 CFR §300.646\(d\)](#).

LEA teams can utilize the considerations below to support in the planning, development, and submission:

<p>Before Development of SFY2026 CCEIS Plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and engage diverse stakeholder group • Gather/summarize data • Select and complete a self-assessment tool • Analyze data independently and as a group to determine root causes/contributing factors <p><i>Reach out to MSDE for any support needed with identifying a self-assessment tool, identifying appropriate data sources to analyze, or support with the root cause analysis processes</i></p>
<p>During Development and Submission of SFY 2026 CCEIS Plan to MSDE</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft the self-assessment narrative • Identify schools/feeders/regions for focused support based on data analysis • Identify possible responses aligned with root causes • Determine feasibility of implementation of proposed responses • Finalize determination of proposed responses, ensuring alignment with root causes • Determine measures and tools to monitor progress towards addressing root cause(s) and impact of activities • Determine costs needed to fund responses and funding source(s) • Check allowability of proposed costs under CCEIS • Describe proposed costs in the plan to support alignment with activity description and root cause(s) • Submit SFY2026 plan to the MSDE secure server <p><i>Reach out to MSDE for any support needed with determining alignment between root causes and responses, ensuring allowability of costs, or submitting through the secure server</i></p>
<p>After Development and Submission of SFY 2026 CCEIS Plan to MSDE</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notify the LEA's MSDE regional fiscal liaison of completed submission via email • Engage with MSDE partners for feedback and revisions, if applicable • Resubmit within the agreed-upon timeline • Look for final approval notification sent to Special Education Director <p><i>Reach out to MSDE for any support needed with implementing and progress monitoring approved CCEIS plan</i></p>

The LEA Process Guidance for SFY2026 CCEIS Plan Development document is intended to serve as a companion to the SFY2026 CCEIS Plan Template. Guidance included in this document is designed to support LEA representatives with the development of planned responses to address root causes of significant disproportionality. While this guidance is not all-encompassing, its purpose is to provide background information regarding federal and State requirements for addressing significant disproportionality and considerations in planning, implementation, and progress monitoring,

MSDE EI&SE CCEIS partners suggest the following uses of this document:

1. Review the Process Guidance document when reviewing your SFY2026 Letter of Significant Disproportionality Report. Ensure all team members are clear on how significant disproportionality is calculated.
2. Review the considerations and guidance questions for the self-assessment before constructing a narrative summary of it.

LEA Process Guidance for SFY2026 CCEIS Plan Development

3. Have a copy of the Process Guidance document open while the LEA team is developing Planned Response Actions and Focus Area Detail templates. Reference the guidance document to ensure prompts are fully addressed.
4. Review budget requirements and referenced resources (such as the Allowable Costs Spotlight document) prior to completing the Budget Tables, C-1-25, and Budget Detail Pages.

MSDE EI&SE team members are available to collaborate and provide technical assistance through completion of the self-assessment process, determination of root causes, development of planned response actions, and determination of costs to support activities, as well as the implementation and progress monitoring of final approved plans. For additional support, please contact your MSDE EI&SE programmatic and fiscal partners to schedule a technical assistance session.

Categories of Analysis of Significant Disproportionality

Table 1 of the SFY26 CCEIS Plan is structured to display the specific local system data related to the Category of Analysis/Significant Disproportionality. The data represented in Table 1 includes information included in the *SFY 2026 Letter of Significant Disproportionality* released annually by MSDE. The LEA must review the data provided in the MSDE report, as well as historical trends, planned response or proactive response implementation data, and other recent system data, to conduct a programmatic self-assessment and root cause analysis.

- **Categories of Analysis of Significant Disproportionality:** Significant Disproportionality is the persistent over-representation of students from a particular racial or ethnic group in one or more of the following categories: identification as a child with a disability or within a specific disability, restrictive placements, and/or disciplinary removals as compared to other groups of students.
 - Identification: Risk ratios are shared in the LEA's *SFY2026 Letter of Significant Disproportionality* for: (1) all disabilities, (2) autism, (3) intellectual disability, (4) specific learning disability, (5) emotional disturbance, (6) speech or language impairment, and (7) other health impairment.
 - Placement: Risk ratios are shared in the LEA's *SFY2026 Letter of Significant Disproportionality* for: (1) inside a regular class for less than 40 percent of the day (indicated in the report as "Regular Class less than 40%"); and (2) inside separate schools and residential facilities, not including homebound or hospital settings, correctional facilities, or private schools (indicated in the report as "Separate School or Residential")
 - Disciplinary Removals: Risk ratios are shared in the LEA's *SFY2026 Letter of Significant Disproportionality* for: (1) out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of 10 days or fewer (indicated in the report as "Out of School Suspension \leq 10 days"), (2) out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days ((indicated in the report as "Out of School Suspension $>$ 10 days"); (3) in-school suspensions of 10 days or fewer (indicated in the report as "In School Suspension \leq 10 days"), (4) in-school suspensions of more than 10 days (indicated in the report as "In School Suspension $>$ 10 days"), and (5) disciplinary removals in total, including in-school and out-of-school suspensions, expulsions, removals by school personnel to an interim alternative educational setting, and removals by a hearing officer (indicated in the report as "Sum Disciplinary Total")
- **Race/Ethnicity:** Risk Ratio is calculated and shared for the following race/ethnicities across all Categories of Analysis: (1) Asian, (2) Black/African American, (3) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, (4) Hispanic/Latino, (5) Two or More Races, (6) American Indian/Alaskan Native, and (7) White.
- **Risk Ratios:** Significant disproportionality is determined based on data patterns over two or more years. For SFY26, data will be calculated for the 2022-2023 school year and the 2023-2024 school year. In Maryland, a local education agency (LEA) is determined to be significantly disproportionate if it has one or more subgroups of students evidencing a risk ratio of greater than 2.0. In the *SFY2026 Letter of Significant Disproportionality*, risk ratios over the 2.0 threshold will be highlighted separately for one year over the threshold and two consecutive years over the threshold without reasonable progress. If reasonable progress is met in the second consecutive year, the LEA is not significantly disproportionate in that Category.
- **Change:** Risk ratios are compared to determine change. Negative values under the "change" column in the *SFY2026 Letter of Significant Disproportionality* indicate a decline in risk ratio between the two years reported.
- **Risk Ratio Needed to Achieve Reasonable Progress:** Reasonable Progress indicates a reduction over a year of 0.15 for risk ratios between 2.0 and 4.0, and a reduction of 0.50 for risk ratios over 4.0. The LEA will calculate the reduction necessary to no longer be considered significantly disproportionate in any identified Categories by subtracting the reduction requirement from the most recently reported risk ratio (2023-2024 school year).

Populations at-risk for significant disproportionality are designated in the *SFY2026 Letter of Significant Disproportionality* to promote the consideration of proactive, mitigating actions necessary to avoid additional determinations. If LEAs elect to address an at-risk area through a planned activity within the SFY26 CCEIS plan, the area(s), race/ethnicity group(s), and risk ratios must be included in the relevant “At-Risk” Table 1 (1b: Identification, 1d: Placement, and/or 1f: Disciplinary Removals) and discussed in the self-assessment. “At-risk” is defined as a risk ratio approaching a threshold of 2.0.

LEAs are responsible for addressing all Categories of Analysis of Significant Disproportionality identified in the annual MSDE Significant Disproportionality Report and identified in Table 1a, 1c, and/or 1e with one or more Planned Response Actions (PRA). Areas identified proactively by the LEA in Table 1b, 1d, and/or 1f must also be addressed by at least one PRA.

Process for Conducting and Completing a Programmatic Self-Assessment and Root Cause Analysis

SELF-ASSESSMENT AND ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS PROCESS

For each area of identified significant disproportionality (and at-risk areas, as appropriate) identified in Table 1, 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 previous 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, preschool trend data related to the long-term effects on disproportionate representation across Identification, Placement, and Disciplinary Removal categories, etc. Data analysis should include comparisons of trends school-, region-, and/or district-wide, and student-specific data should include a comparison across multiple race/ethnicity groups. Discussion of processes used, data analyzed, findings, and determinations should be summarized in the “Description of Self-Assessment Process and Data Findings” box on the SFY2026 CCEIS Plan Template. The LEA may submit addendums as needed to support conclusions regarding root causes of significant disproportionality.

SELECTION AND COMPLETION OF A PROGRAMMATIC SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOL

The LEA is required to (a) identify a self-assessment tool recommended by MSDE to support in the root cause analysis process (listed below), (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 in the “Description of Self-Assessment Process and Data Findings” box, and (d) include a copy of the results of the tool with the CCEIS plan submission.

- [IDEA Data Center - Success Gaps Rubric: Addressing Equity, Inclusion, and Opportunity \(2021 Version\)](#)
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.
- [National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments – Addressing the Root Causes of Disparities in School Discipline](#)
(NOTE: LEAs utilizing this tool must submit a copy of Resource 4: Disciplinary Disparities Risk Assessment Tool)
According to the National Center on Safe Supporting Learning Environments, “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.
- [WestEd - Assessing and Improving Special Education: A Program Review Tool for Schools and Districts Engaged in Rapid School Improvement](#)
According to 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.

DESCRIBING THE SELF-ASSESSMENT PROCESS, DATA FINDINGS, AND DETERMINATION OF ROOT CAUSES OF SIGNIFICANT DISPROPORTIONALITY

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; consistency of implementation of system

policies, procedures, and practices at the district, school, and/or classroom level; and environmental factors such as trauma, poverty, and/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 ([34 CFR §300.226\(d\)](#)). The [Guiding Questions](#) (next section of the guidance document) linked to EACH category of significant disproportionality will 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.

A summary of the data considered and the reflective data analysis (including evidence of consideration of the relevant Guiding Questions), along with determinations made by the team regarding root cause factors and contributing factors, will be summarized in the “Description of Self-Assessment Process and Data Findings” box.

DETERMINING ROOT CAUSE FACTORS

Based upon the reflective consideration of the guiding questions, data analysis, and the contributing factors contributing to high rates of identification/placement/disciplinary removals, the LEA will determine root causes of significant disproportionality. Enter root cause(s) into Table 2.

Some key factors to consider when determining root cause factors:

- Ensure root cause factors are supported by data, and that data points have been summarized and shared (with patterns/trends identified) in the self-assessment process description.
- Ensure root cause factors are within the LEA’s control.
- Ensure the root cause factors are determined based on input/data from various stakeholders (district-level, school-level, community, etc.)
- Determine if root cause factors impacts are system-wide or school/region/program-specific.
- Consider previous year’s root causes and Planned Response Actions. Provide data to support or refute the continued impact of root causes on the Category(ies) identified as significantly disproportionate.

IDENTIFYING SCHOOL/FEEDER PATTERNS

As a result of the self-assessment and root cause analysis, the LEA is asked to identify the individual school(s) and/or region(s) within the local system that are the most significantly disproportionate and/or settings where focused academic/behavioral intervening supports and/or professional development will most likely lead to addressing the root causes of significant disproportionality based on a variety of factors. Schools/regions should be determined based on a number of data points, including (but not limited to): comparison of risk ratios, analysis of school- or region-based fidelity data and subsequent patterns/trends of behavior by adults, impacts of feeder patterns on practices, disaggregated data related to implementation of policies, procedures, practices, and interventions, consideration of other school-wide initiatives which may impact the school’s ability to implement CCEIS activities, availability and implementation fidelity of structures for data-informed decision-making, access to ongoing professional learning/job-embedded coaching, etc. Within the SFY2026 CCEIS plan, Table 3 will capture the patterns/trends identified and schools/feeders prioritized for targeted support to address factors contributing to significant disproportionality.

To complete Table 3:

- Include all Categories of Analysis and At-risk Areas identified in Table 1. Schools/regions must be identified for all areas in Table 1.

- List the schools with trends/patterns contributing to significant disproportionality.
- Present data aligned with each Category of Analysis and/or At-risk Area identified in Table 1.
- Provide factors specific to each school/region contributing to disproportionate practices. For instance: a school does not consistently implement an established identification policy; a school team does not utilize data-informed decision-making to determine placement; a school does not have access to an intervention to address a skill need, resulting in referral under a specific incident category; etc.
- Ensure data and contributing factors identified in Table 3 are consistent with data discussion presented in the “Description of Self-Assessment Process and Data Findings” box.

CCEIS Plan Self-Assessment Guiding Questions

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

IDENTIFICATION GUIDING QUESTIONS:

- What are the patterns of identification by age/grade band and race/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. LEA may also want to review students changed from developmental delay to another eligibility category to identify any disproportionate patterns.)*
- 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 available across schools? Is the fidelity of implementation comparable across schools? Do all groups of students access them equally?
- 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 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 GUIDING QUESTIONS:

- What are the patterns of placement in separate classes and/or schools? Do they vary based on the availability of 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 age/grade levels? (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 are the 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 GUIDING QUESTIONS:

- Review the relevant 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
 - Types of offenses resulting in suspension
 - Percentage of referrals leading to suspension
 - Rates of students with multiple suspensions
- What patterns by race/ethnicity are evident? Are some groups of students more likely to be referred and/or 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 age/grade 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 2/Tier 3 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?

Development of Planned Response Action(s)

The Planned Response Action(s) (PRAs) describe 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 root cause identified in the self-assessment section must be addressed by at least one PRA. 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 and job-embedded coaching 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. 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 data-informed decision-making practices, or other factors as supported by data in the self-assessment;
- Implementation of academic interventions and supports with targeted students to address gaps in access to MTSS;
- Implementation of behavioral interventions and supports with targeted students to address gaps in access to MTSS;
- Review and revision of policies and procedures, including supplemental guidance documents to reinforce expectations; and/or
- 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 Budget Table for Planned Response Action(s) is required for each PRA to align proposed expenditures to activities.
- Collaborate with your MSDE programmatic and fiscal liaisons to determine allowable costs and alignment between root causes and proposed actions.

DEVELOPMENT OF GOALS AND INTERIM BENCHMARKS

Goals/Interim benchmarks are developed to outline how the LEA will monitor the impact of the activities described in the PRA focus areas.

- The **goals** are designed to measure the activity's overall impact on the reduction of significant disproportionality in the aligned area(s).
 - Each PRA must have at least one aligned goal, and at least one goal must be aligned to the conclusion of the grant period (September 30, 2027).

- A goal must include: an expected completion date, an expected measure of progress, and a data source/tool used to measure progress.
- The **interim benchmarks** are designed to measure progress and impact of implementation of specific focus area activities to address the aligned root causes and build towards achievement of the overall goal.
 - At least one interim benchmark must be developed and aligned with each activity described in the focus areas (Review and/or Adjustment to Policies, Procedures, and/or Practices, Academic or Behavior Intervention, and/or Professional Learning).
 - Interim benchmarks must include: an expected completion date, an expected measure of progress, and a data source/tool used to measure progress. Interim benchmarks must also include implementation measures to monitor the impact of all activities outlined in the PRA.
 - At least one benchmark must be aligned to each reporting period (January 30, 2026, January 30, 2027, and September 30, 2027). Therefore, a minimum of three benchmarks are required for each PRA.
 - Benchmarks may be independent or build upon previous progress
 - Independent Benchmarks Example (aligned to two different activities): January 30, 2027, benchmark expects 40% increase in fidelity of implementation for professional learning activity, September 30, 2027, benchmark expects 100% compliance with established procedures for review and/or adjustment to policies, procedures, and/or practices activity
 - Building Progress Benchmarks Example (aligned to the same activity): January 30, 2026, benchmark expects a 20% increase in fidelity of implementation for professional learning activity, January 30, 2027, expects a 40% increase in fidelity of implementation for the same professional learning activity

Note: While each PRA is required to include at least one goal and at least three interim benchmarks, the LEA may opt to include as many goals/interim benchmarks as necessary to monitor progress of outlined activities using a timeline that is appropriate and aligned to the focus area description(s).

DATA SOURCES/METHODS OF EVALUATING

For each measurement tool identified in the goals/benchmarks, the LEA must establish a structure for monitoring the collection of data and analyzing the data/progress monitoring to determine next steps or adjustments.

- **Data Source(s)/Method(s) for Evaluating:** For each goal and interim benchmark, list the data tool/source used to monitor implementation outlined in the goal/interim benchmarks. Include both fidelity of implementation and student outcome measures.
- **Frequency of Collection and Analysis:** Indicate the frequency with which the LEA monitoring team will collect and analyze data. For most data sources, a minimum review quarterly is suggested. Determine the appropriate frequency based on the type of data collected, the frequency with which the data will be collected, and the expected progress/timeline outlined in the focus area description and goals/interim benchmarks.
- **Completion date:** Indicate when the LEA team will cease collecting and monitoring data. Ensure this date aligns with the expected progress/timeline outlined in the goal/interim benchmarks.
- **Staff Responsible for Progress Monitoring:** Identify the positions of all staff members responsible for analyzing data (ex: CCEIS Coach, School Principal, Director of Student Services, etc.)

Developing CCEIS Plan PRA Focus Area Descriptions

Utilize the guidance below to determine the template necessary to describe the proposed activity. An LEA can elect to have multiple focus area description templates included under a PRA.

MSDE GUIDANCE FOR SELECTING APPROPRIATE FOCUS AREA TEMPLATES TO COMPLETE FOR EACH PRA

- **Review and/or Adjustment to Policies, Procedures, and/or Practices:** This template should be utilized when outlining the review or adjustment of any existing policies, procedures, and/or practices aligned with a root cause of significant disproportionality. Additionally, this template should be utilized to outline any new policies, procedures, and practices to be developed and implemented to address root cause(s). Review and adjustment of policies includes the review of existing guidance documents or tools aligned with policies or the development of new tools to support consistent implementation of policies (examples: Code of Conduct, decision-making matrices, checklists to support decision-making, etc.).
 - *NOTE: At least one focus area description outlining a review and/or adjustment to policy, procedure, or practice must be included for each Category of Analysis and At-risk Area identified in Table 1.*
- **Academic or Behavior Intervention:** This template should be utilized when outlining the delivery of a specific intervention (either academic or behavior) to students within targeted schools to address a gap in MTSS accessibility. Interventions selected should be evidence- and/or research-based, with the objective/focus aligned with at least one root cause identified in the plan. The intervention template should not be completed if an activity does not include the direct participation of students. If more than one intervention has been identified, the LEA must define the intended outcome/impact on root cause, participants (students), schools, implementers, data sources, and timeline for EACH intervention named in the section.
 - *Note: LEAs are not required to design an academic or behavior intervention to address root causes but may opt to do so if it is an appropriate response.*
- **Professional Learning:** This template should be utilized for any professional learning aligned with root cause(s) identified in the self-assessment. Examples could include implicit bias, data-informed decision-making, etc. If more than one professional learning topic is identified, the LEA must define the intended outcome/impact on root cause, schools, participants (staff members), structure of training and coaching (schedule/format/duration/personnel), data sources, and timeline for EACH topic.
 - *NOTE: LEAs are not required to design a professional learning activity to address root causes but may opt to do so if it is an appropriate response. However, training which is necessary to implement either a review/adjustment to a policy/procedure/practice or an academic or behavior intervention must also include a professional learning section outlining the structure of the training and subsequent job-embedded coaching. Examples could include training on how to implement a new guidance tool, training on how to implement and monitor a new intervention, refresher training for an existing intervention to strengthen implementation fidelity or data-based decision making, training to reinforce existing policy/procedures to increase compliance, etc.*

Utilize the following guidance to ensure each Focus Area Description includes enough information to communicate the intended structure for implementation and monitoring of each activity.

MSDE GUIDANCE FOR COMPLETING THE REVIEW AND/OR ADJUSTMENT TO POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND PRACTICES TEMPLATE:

Adjustment/Review Template Prompt	MSDE Guidance for Completion
<p>How does the activity address the root cause(s) identified?</p>	<p>Identify the specific root cause that will be addressed by the proposed activity. Discuss why the LEA team’s intentional design of the activity will mitigate the impact of the root cause on disparate outcomes. Share any historical information (such as previous implementation fidelity or when the policy/practice/procedure was implemented/revised last) which may support the activity design.</p>
<p>What policies, procedures, and/or practices are being targeted?</p>	<p>Identify the specific policy, procedures, and/or practices the team has determined are aligned with root causes. If a published policy or procedure is being reviewed, and there are supporting documents outlining the current policy expectations, an LEA may reference or attach the document(s) for reference.</p>
<p>What is the intended outcome of revisions to the policies, procedures, and/or practices and the impact on the root cause factor(s)?</p>	<p>Discuss the anticipated results of the review and/or adjustment. Will revisions to written policy be made? Are current policies/procedures not being implemented consistently or with fidelity, and if so, why? If a written policy does not currently exist, and does the LEA believe a written policy is necessary? Does the LEA anticipate developing guidance documents or tools to support implementation of policies/procedures/practices in alignment with the LEA’s expectations?</p>
<p>Who is responsible for implementing this activity?</p>	<p>Define who will lead the review and/or adjustment process and any participants expected to participate in the decision-making process. Participants can be identified by position (ex: Director of Special Education, Director of Student Services, etc.). Ensure there is diverse stakeholder representation inclusive of partners responsible for determining, implementing, and monitoring changes to policy/procedure/practice. Define the participants’ responsibilities within the process.</p>
<p>What school(s) are targeted for this work?</p>	<p>Discuss which schools will be targeted for implementation to the activity. If the adjustment/review is systematic, define and discuss why this decision was made.</p>
<p>What is the process for communicating revisions of policies, procedures, and/or practices to address significant disproportionality to relevant stakeholders?</p>	<p>If revisions are anticipated, discuss how the LEA will share those revisions to policy/procedure/practice in writing with the school community and any external partners. Discuss how the LEA will share any changes resulting from the review/adjustment to policies/procedures/practices with district- and school-based stakeholders, including those responsible for implementation and monitoring. Ensure the focus area description discusses how information will be communicated to all staff. For instance, if only administrators are to receive training on the adjustment, how will changes be communicated to teachers, related service providers, etc.? NOTE: If training is required to reinforce adjustments, a professional learning focus area description template should also be completed to outline the structure, participants, and alignment to the root cause.</p>
<p>Impact Data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the implementation of changes be monitored (including data sources and schedule of review)? 	<p>Identify the data sources and schedule for reviewing progress to measure the implementation fidelity of any changes to the policy/procedures/practices targeted, and the impact on students. Identify the LEA’s process and sources for determining if staff at the district and school level are implementing policies consistently and in alignment with LEA expectations.</p>

Adjustment/Review Template Prompt	MSDE Guidance for Completion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the impact on students be monitored (include data sources and schedule of review)? • How will the LEA monitor the impact on adult behaviors and practices, including the implementation of policies, procedures, and practices addressed through this activity? 	
<p>Identify the timeline (including start and end dates) for implementation and progress monitoring of this PRA activity:</p>	<p>Outline when the activity will begin and end by month and year. If the adjustment, review, and determination of changes will be implemented for a brief period of time, but communication and monitoring will extend for a longer period, state the timeline encompassing both portions of the activity. Ensure the timeline established aligns with interim benchmarks outlined to measure implementation fidelity/impact.</p>

MSDE GUIDANCE FOR COMPLETING THE ACADEMIC OR BEHAVIOR INTERVENTION TEMPLATE:

Intervention Template Prompt	MSDE Guidance for Completion
Identify the intervention focus: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION or BEHAVIOR INTERVENTION	State if the intervention addresses a gap in access to academic or behavioral MTSS.
How does the activity address the root cause(s) identified?	Identify the specific root cause that will be addressed by the proposed activity. Discuss why the LEA team’s intentional design of the activity will mitigate the impact of the root cause on disparate outcomes. Share any historical information (such as previous implementation fidelity/impact data or the impact similarly designed interventions which have been previously implemented) which may support the activity design.
What is the intervention to be implemented?	Name the specific intervention to be implemented in response to aligned root causes. Describe the intervention's focus.
Which school(s) will be involved, and why were they identified?	Define the schools participating in the intervention based on patterns/trends identified in Table 3 and the Self-Assessment. Discuss why schools were specifically identified as needing access to the intervention outlined within the focus area. Ensure relevant supporting data is included in the Self-Assessment discussion to support inclusion of schools in specific activities.
How will students be selected (including process, required data, and criteria) for participation in the intervention?	Define the criteria for participation in the intervention. Discuss how the school-based staff will determine a student’s appropriateness for participation
Approximately how many students with disabilities will participate within the timeline established across all schools by race/ethnicity?	<p>Identify the approximate number of participants based on the participating schools and define by listing next to each race/ethnicity category. If the activity timeline spans multiple school years within the grant period, state the total number of anticipated participants through the duration of the activity.</p> <p>Students with disabilities cannot be the only targeted group to participate in CCEIS responses. CCEIS interventions are to supplement services to students. For more information, review the federal guidance, Significant Disproportionality (Equity in IDEA) Essential Questions and Answers (March 2017) or consult with your MSDE CCEIS partners.</p>
Approximately how many students without disabilities will participate within the timeline established across all schools by race/ethnicity?	Identify the approximate number of participants based on the participating schools and define by listing next to each race/ethnicity category. If the activity timeline spans multiple school years within the grant period, state the total number of anticipated participants through the duration of the activity.
Staff responsible for implementing the intervention:	What internal and/or external partners will be responsible for implementing the intervention with students? For internal staff, define if staff are school- or district-based. If district-based, discuss how school-based staff will communicate with district staff regarding progress and decision-making
How will the staff implementing the intervention be coached and trained?	Define the structures for professional learning and ongoing coaching aligned with implementation and progress monitoring of the intervention. Discuss if training will be delivered by an internal or external partner. If necessary, complete a professional learning template to discuss the specifics of how staff will receive training.

Intervention Template Prompt	MSDE Guidance for Completion
How will staff’s fidelity of implementation of the intervention be monitored (include data sources and process)?	Outline the data source(s) to be used to measure implementation fidelity of the intervention in alignment with established criteria. For each source identified, outline the schedule of review by the LEA team to monitor progress.
What student data will be collected and on what schedule?	Define the student outcome data source(s) to be used to monitor impact of the intervention and the schedule of review by those responsible for progress monitoring.
What process will the LEA utilize to determine the impact of participation and appropriateness of continued participation in the intervention?	Discuss the process the LEA will utilize to review student data and determine if the impact implementation on root causes of significant disproportionality. Define what data will be required to support a student’s continued participation or dismissal from the intervention. Identify the timeline/data for making individual student determinations of the appropriateness of continuing the intervention or need to discontinue the intervention.
Identify the timeline (including start and end dates) for implementation and progress monitoring of this PRA activity:	Outline when the activity will begin and end by month and year. If the activity will be implemented for a short period of time, but progress monitoring will extend for a longer period of time, state the timeline encompassing both portions of the activity. Ensure the timeline established aligns with interim benchmarks outlined to measure implementation fidelity/impact.

MSDE GUIDANCE FOR COMPLETING THE PROFESSIONAL LEARNING ACTIVITIES TEMPLATE:

Professional Learning Template Prompt	MSDE Guidance for Completion
<p>How does the activity address the root cause(s) identified?</p>	<p>Identify the specific root cause that will be addressed by the proposed activity. Discuss why the LEA team’s intentional design of the activity will mitigate the impact of the root cause on disparate outcomes. Share any historical information (such as previous implementation, impact data, or similar responses implemented with positive impacts) which may support the activity design.</p>
<p>What is the intended outcome of professional learning and its impact on the root cause factor(s)?</p>	<p>Identify the intended outcome of the training. Define what participants are expected to do after participating in training and job-embedded coaching. Consider/reference contributing factors and/or patterns/trends established within the self-assessment. Include the topics to be addressed and link back to the aligned root cause(s).</p>
<p>Who will participate in professional learning and job-embedded coaching?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role(s) of participant(s) within the selected school/region: • Approximate Number of participant(s): • Which schools are being identified by this capacity building activity? • Why were the above-named schools selected? 	<p>List the participants for each training topic. Determine an approximate number of participants based on schools identified and patterns/trends identified in Table 3 and the Self-Assessment. Identify the schools from table 3 participating in training. Discuss why schools were specifically identified as participating in training topics outlined within the focus area.</p>
<p>How will the training be implemented?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anticipated Schedule: • Anticipated Format: • Approximate Duration of Training Sessions: • Personnel Responsible for Implementing Training: <p>How will job-embedded coaching be implemented and by whom?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anticipated Schedule: • Anticipated Format: • Approximate Duration of Each Training Session: • Personnel Responsible for Implementing Job-Embedded Coaching: 	<p>Detail the training and coaching structure which will ensure consistent implementation and sustainability of practices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule: When is the training/coaching expected to take place? • Format: How will the training/coaching be delivered? (ex: hybrid, face to face, through a scheduled department or content meeting, etc.) • Duration: How long will training sessions last? For coaching, how long with sessions last for most participants? • Personnel responsible: What internal and/or external partners will be responsible for implementation of training/coaching? Ensure the structure for training coaches is also outlined within the focus area description.
<p>What implementation data will be collected and on what schedule?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation Data Sources: • Schedule of review for each source: <p>How will the impact on students be measured?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact Data Sources: • Schedule of Review for each source: 	<p>Outline the data sources which will be utilized to measure (1) implementation fidelity of strategies from professional learning/coaching and (2) student outcome data to measure the impact of the implementation of strategies. For each source identified, outline the schedule of review by the LEA team to monitor progress.</p>

Professional Learning Template Prompt	MSDE Guidance for Completion
<p>How will the LEA monitor the impact on adult behaviors and/practices as a result of professional learning and/or coaching?</p>	<p>Discuss how the LEA team will ensure strategies are implemented with fidelity and ensure sustainability. What measures will be used, and how will the LEA team review them to make decisions about additional training or adjustments to coaching schedule or duration?</p>
<p>Identify the timeline (including start and end dates) for implementation and progress monitoring of this PRA activity:</p>	<p>Outline when the activity will begin and end by month and year. If the activity will be implemented for a brief period of time, but coaching will extend for a longer period, state the timeline encompassing both portions of the activity. Ensure the timeline established aligns with interim benchmarks outlined to measure implementation fidelity/impact.</p>

Supporting Fiscal Documents and Plan Approvals

In accordance with [34 CFR §300.646](#) and federal guidance [Significant Disproportionality \(Equity in IDEA\) Essential Questions and Answers \(March 2017\)](#), 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. The mandatory reserved funds are pre-calculated for each LEA, and the totals are available on the allocation sheet.

Students with disabilities cannot be the only targeted group to participate in CCEIS responses. Additionally, CCEIS-funded interventions are to **supplement** services to students. For more information, review the federal guidance, [Significant Disproportionality \(Equity in IDEA\) Essential Questions and Answers \(March 2017\)](#). For more details on allowable costs for CCEIS funds, please refer to [Allowable Costs Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services \(CCEIS\)](#), located on the MSDE EI&SE CCEIS website. MSDE EI&SE Programmatic and Fiscal partners can support with the determination of allowable costs for Proposed Response Action(s).

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

Submit the following required fiscal documents as part of the LEA's CCEIS Plan, in addition to the Budget Table(s) For Planned Response Actions embedded within the plan template:

MSDE Grant Budget C-1-25: LEAs that have been identified as having significant disproportionality must complete a separate MSDE Grant Budget C-1-25 for each CCEIS grant listed on the LEA's allocation sheet (IDEA Part B 611 and IDEA Part B 619). If the LEA chooses to combine the state-calculated allocations for Part B 611 and Part B 619, then it is only necessary to submit one MSDE Grant Budget C-1-25. MSDE, EI&SE, Resource Management & Monitoring Branch (RMMB) will request that all LEAs complete a CCEIS Declaration Form before changing the distribution of the Part B 611 and/or 619 allocations.

Upon approval, a revised SFY 2026 Local Allocation Sheet reflecting the proposed changes will be issued by the MSDE, EI&SE, RMMB.

Budget Detail Form: 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.

FISCAL PROGRESS REPORTS:

- January 31, 2026 – MSDE EI&SE Progress/Cumulative Variance Report IDEA Part B 611/619 Part D Grant Users #1 for all SFY 2026 CCEIS Plans ending September 30, 2027.

LEA Process Guidance for SFY2026 CCEIS Plan Development

- January 31, 2027 - MSDE EI&SE Progress/Cumulative Variance Report IDEA Part B 611/619 Part D #2 for all SFY 2026 CCEIS Plans ending September 30, 2027.
- November 30, 2027 - MSDE EI&SE Progress/Cumulative Variance Report IDEA Part B 611/619 Part D Grant Users Final Report for all SFY 2026 CCEIS Plans ending September 30, 2027.

ADDITIONAL DATES:

- August 15, 2027– Final Grant Amendment Requests due for all SFY 2026 CCEIS Plans ending September 30, 2027.

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.

MSDE Submission Review Look-Fors

The Maryland State Department of Education Division of Early Intervention and Special Education Services (MSDE EI&SE) Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CCEIS) Team utilizes a multi-level review process to determine if a submitted CCEIS plan meets State and federal expectations for approval and/or to determine feedback to ensure a plan is substantially approvable. While each submitted CCEIS Plan is reviewed individually for alignment based on the Categories of Analysis and At-risk Areas identified, data analysis presented, root causes determined, and proposed activities to address significant disproportionality, a standard set of “look-fors” guides these individual and team reviews to ensure consistency and clarity.

Local Education Agency representatives (LEAs) may wish to utilize these “look-fors” as a guide when developing initial CCEIS self-assessments and plans to ensure alignment with federal and State expectations for addressing significant disproportionality. For more information, please contact the MSDE EI&SE CCEIS team.

SELF-ASSESSMENT LOOK-FORS:

- Categories of Analysis and At-Risk Areas (Table 1):
 - Categories of Analysis, Race/Ethnicity Group, and Risk Ratios match those identified in the *MSDE Significant Disproportionality Report* distributed annually to the LEA.
 - The LEA has accurately calculated the risk ratio needed to achieve reasonable progress based on the requirements outlined in the *MSDE Significant Disproportionality Report*.
 - All areas of significant disproportionality identified in the MSDE Significant Disproportionality Report are included in Table 1.
 - If the LEA has selected an at-risk area to address within the SFY2026 CCEIS Plan, it is listed in the appropriate “at-risk” Table 1 and accurate risk ratios/race/ethnicity groups are included.
- Completion of a Self-Assessment Tool:
 - The “Description of Self-Assessment Process and Data Findings” (SFY2026 IDEA Part B CCEIS Plan Template Document, page 7) identifies the MSDE-approved self-assessment tool(s) utilized to support root cause analysis, describes the process by which the LEA team completed the tool, and summarizes the results. (*Note: For MSDE pre-approved tools, consult the [Process Guidance](#) document*).
 - The submission includes a copy of the completed MSDE-approved self-assessment tool results. The completed tool is recommended by MSDE or previously approved if not one of the recommended options listed in the Process Guidance.
 - Participants in the team completing the tool represent a diverse group of stakeholders within the LEA. At least, stakeholders participating in completing the tool should be cross-departmental.
- Analysis of Relevant Data and Determination of Root Causes (Description of Self-Assessment Process and Data Findings and Table 2):
 - The data analysis description summarizes the LEA’s examination of the decision-making processes, procedures, and practices for students ages 3 through 21 with an intentional focus on the impact of Identification, Placement, and/or Disciplinary Removals (as appropriate based on Table 1 Categories of Analysis and At-risk Areas) on LEA trends, patterns, and outcomes.
 - The “Description of Self-Assessment Process and Data Findings” includes discussion responding to the relevant guiding questions provided in the [Process Guide](#) to complete a reflective analysis of LEA barriers/challenges.
 - The “Description of Self-Assessment Process and Data Findings” includes a summary of the LEA’s prior responses (either previously or currently implemented) to address similar root causes and/or Categories of Analysis, particularly for LEAs in CCEIS for concurrent years.

- The “Description of Self-Assessment Process and Data Findings” includes data analysis for all Categories of Analysis and At-Risk Areas identified in Table 1.
- Within the “Description of Self-Assessment Process and Data Findings” section, a summary is provided of the root cause analysis findings by the LEA team and the determination of final root causes to be addressed within the SFY2026 CCEIS Plan.
 - Final root cause factors selected are within the LEA’s control or influence impacting significant disproportionality.
 - Root causes align with and are supported by data presented in the self-assessment tool and/or addendums, and for which the LEA team’s data analysis is described within the “Description of Self-Assessment Process and Data Findings” section.
- The LEA presents an analysis of data disaggregated by school and/or regions in the self-assessment narrative or addendums to support connection to root causes.
- All root causes to be addressed by the SFY2026 CCEIS Plan have been identified in Table 2.
- Selection of School/Feeder Patterns for Intervention (Table 3):
 - Table 3 identifies individual schools and/or regions contributing to patterns of disproportionality due to root causes. Schools and/or regions identified are aligned with data discussion presented in the “Description of Self-Assessment Process and Data Findings.”
 - Table 3 is completed with all required data for each Category of Analysis and At-Risk Areas identified in Table 1.
 - Table 3 identifies contributing factors specific to identified schools/regions which have contributed to disproportionate practices within that school/feeder aligned with the root cause(s) identified.

PLANNED RESPONSE ACTION(S) (PRA) AND FOCUS AREA(S) LOOK-FORS:

- Goals/Interim Benchmarks:
 - Each PRA includes a comprehensive system for the evaluation of plan outcomes that emphasizes teacher/staff fidelity of implementation and measurable student outcomes:
 - Each PRA includes at least one Goal which measures the expected impact of implementation on root causes of significant disproportionality.
 - Each PRA includes Measurable Outcomes which establish the parameters of success, changes in behavior or condition and define the fulfillment of purpose and/or program.
 - All Goals/Interim Benchmarks include timeline, measurement of progress, and measurement tool. These components align with the expectations, timeline, and tools outlined in the Focus Area Description(s).
 - At least one interim benchmark for each activity is identified to measure the implementation and/or impact on adult behavior(s)
 - At least one goal is identified for each PRA and at least one interim benchmark is aligned with each activity described in the Focus Area(s).
- Data Sources Table:
 - Data sources match those outlined in the Goals and Interim Benchmarks and include at least one measure of implementation for each activity.
 - All columns of the data sources table are completed.
- General:
 - The template is completed correctly with the PRA numbered, aligned Categories of Analysis and At-risk Areas listed, all root causes to be addressed listed, and funding source identified.
 - Each Category of Analysis and At-Risk Area identified in Table 1 is addressed by at least one PRA. Category of Analysis and Race/Ethnicity Group matches Table 1 and the *MSDE Significant Disproportionality Report*.
 - Each root cause identified in the self-assessment is addressed by at least one PRA. Root causes listed exactly match those identified in the Root Causes Table (Table 2) in the self-assessment.

- Focus Area Activities: Review and/or Adjustment to Policy, Procedure, and/or Practice:
 - Each PRA activity includes a comprehensive system for the evaluation of plan outcomes that emphasizes teacher/staff fidelity of implementation and measurable student outcomes.
 - Each PRA describes the specific actions, intervening supports, and capacity-building activities needed to target the identified root cause(s) of significant disproportionality.
 - The LEA has addressed and reviewed at least one policy, practice, and/or procedure identified by the LEA as contributing to the significant disproportionality for each Category of Analysis (as outlined in [34 CFR §300.646 \(d\)\(1\)\(iii\)](#)). The policy/procedure/practice identified aligns with identified root cause(s) and data presented in the self-assessment section.
 - The LEA has identified at least one data source to monitor implementation fidelity and impact.
 - The LEA has completed all prompts fully and in alignment with the [Process Guidance](#). In completing the required prompts of the Review and/or Adjustment to Policies, Procedures, and/or Practices, the LEA has considered implementation drivers: staffing, training, ongoing coaching, and consultation, staff performance evaluation, data systems that support decision making, progress monitoring, implementation with fidelity, and effective evaluation.
- Focus Area Activities: Academic or Behavior Intervention (*if applicable*):
 - Each PRA describes the specific actions, intervening supports, and capacity-building activities needed to target the identified root cause(s) of significant disproportionality.
 - Any intervention designed by the LEA as a planned response is aligned with identified at least one root cause listed in Table 2 and data presented in the self-assessment section.
 - If intervention has been previously implemented, LEA has provided historical data and a description of the impact to support the continuation and/or expansion of the intervention in either the Focus Area Description or in the self-assessment (“Description of Self-Assessment Process and Data Findings” box).
 - Intervention(s) identified are research- and/or evidence-based.
 - The LEA has identified at least one data source to monitor implementation fidelity and impact.
 - The LEA has completed all prompts fully and in alignment with the [Process Guidance](#). In completing the required prompts of the Intervention Focus Area Template, the LEA has considered implementation drivers: staffing, training, ongoing coaching, and consultation, staff performance evaluation, data systems that support decision making, progress monitoring, implementation with fidelity, and effective evaluation.
- Focus Area: Professional Learning Activities (*if applicable*):
 - Each PRA describes the specific actions, intervening supports, and capacity-building activities needed to target the identified root cause(s) of significant disproportionality.
 - If professional learning on identified topic(s) has been previously implemented, LEA has provided historical data and a description of the impact to support the continuation and/or expansion of professional learning and job-embedded coaching in either the Focus Area Description or in the self-assessment (“Description of Self-Assessment Process and Data Findings” box) ..
 - The LEA has identified at least one data source to monitor implementation fidelity and impact.
 - The LEA has completed all prompts fully and in alignment with the [Process Guidance](#). In completing the required prompts of the Professional Learning Focus Area Template, the LEA has considered implementation drivers: staffing, training, ongoing coaching, and consultation, staff performance evaluation, data systems that support decision making, progress monitoring, implementation with fidelity, and effective evaluation.

BUDGET LOOK-FORS:

- LEA has aligned projected expenditures with specific actions necessary to mitigate root cause factors and meet CCEIS plan outcomes.
- Budget costs are clearly described within the focus area descriptions.
- All budget items are allowable.

LEA Process Guidance for SFY2026 CCEIS Plan Development

- LEA has included a separate Budget Table(s) For Planned Response Actions embedded within the plan template for each PRA to describe how the LEA will expend the mandatory reserved CCEIS 611 and 619 funds through identified activities under the PRA.
- LEA has submitted a completed C-1-25 and Budget Detail page summarizing proposed expenditures for all activities in alignment with [Process Guidance](#).
- Allocations of CCEIS 611 and 619 funds are equal to the State Calculated Total.