

**OFFICE OF CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER**  
**Summary of State Board of Education Agenda Items**  
**September 28, 2023**

**OFFICE OF SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT**

01. Information: Review the amendment to Mississippi’s Consolidated State Plan, also referred to as Mississippi Succeeds [Goals 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 – MBE Strategic Plan]

Background Information: The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 1965 reauthorized as the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015 outlines requirements for administration and implementation of the consolidated state plan. In April 2023, MS submitted its amendment to the US Department of Education, to address needed modifications to accountability and school improvement. Additional modifications were addressed following a closer review and are being presented for inclusion in the submitted amendment.

Purpose: Submit finalized adjustments and revisions by program offices, following a review of applicable sections, to the United States Department of Education for approval.

This item references Goals 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 of the *Mississippi Board of Education Strategic Plan*.


Information Only

Back-up material attached

**Each respondent was sent a reply email confirming receipt of the submitted public comment. A copy of each submitted letter has been provided.**

Comment	Organization	Comment By	Date Received/Time	Method of Delivery	Response By
<p>I would like to comment on the proposed changes to the MS Consolidated State Plan. I am the English Learner Coordinator for our school district and have been very concerned with the exit criteria as written in the original State Plan. Our English Learners are not being served well when the federal guidelines of achieving a level 4 or 5 overall on the Las Links assessment removes them from the accountability side of academics, yet our State Plan requires a level 4 or 5 on reading, writing, and overall to enable them to have the accomplishment of being able to exit service and begin the monitoring process. For school year 2022-2023, we had a student achieve a level 5 in reading, a level 4 in overall, but miss the cut score of 532 by one point in writing, which requires the student to continue services but yet removes them from accountability.</p> <p>The amended State Plan provides a way for students to achieve a level 4 or 5 overall and exit services yet still maintain the monitoring of those students to ensure their English proficiency.</p> <p>Another area in which I am involved in providing support is through the school improvement efforts. Again, the logistics of exit criteria appears to provide unrealistic goals of which all sub-groups have not achieved. The growth of all sub-groups should be the most important and not a gap-to-goal criteria that no other sub-groups could achieve. Placing such a burdensome criteria on schools while not recognizing the most important effect of growth on each sub-group should be amended as I believe the proposal begins to work toward.</p> <p>I also believe that school improvement entrance and exit should be looked at more closely even after the State Plan amendment process is completed.</p>	<p>Alcorn Co. School District</p>	<p>Brian Phelps Federal Programs Director</p>	<p>August 2, 2023</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Sonja Robertson and Alan Burrow</p> <p>This public comment period is to address the ATSI to CSI escalation exit criteria, which does not include the “gap to goal” factor. The exit criteria for TSI was modified and has been approved by the U.S. Department of Education. It now includes a growth component that aligns with the state’s accountability model.</p> <p>The changes to the language in the plan regarding English learners are clarifications of current accountability business rules and will not affect accountability measures. The EL Progress measure does not affect decisions on whether or not an EL student continues to receive services or enters monitoring status. These exit requirements are separate from the EL Progress measure in accountability, and were established as such to ensure that students receive EL services independently of the requirements to measure EL progress under ESSA.</p>

**Each respondent was sent a reply email confirming receipt of the submitted public comment. A copy of each submitted letter has been provided.**

Comment	Organization	Comment By	Date Received/Time	Method of Delivery	Response By
<p>August 4, 2023</p> <p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>In response to the invitation to provide public comment regarding the Mississippi Succeeds Consolidated State Plan, I want to bring to your attention the topic of ELs.</p> <p>While the federal government requires accountability reporting on 10 subgroups including ELs, the approach that Mississippi has taken does not lend itself to supporting the endeavors of our state's teachers, administrators, schools, and districts.</p> <p>In Mississippi, we have an approximate EL count of 3.2%. Similarly, Louisiana reflects an EL population of 3.7%, 3.8% in Alabama, and 3.4% in Ohio, with these figures extracted from the IES NCES Digest of Education Statistics 2020 Tables and Figures (<a href="https://nces.ed.gov/">https://nces.ed.gov/</a>)</p> <p>To compare and contrast how we measure and report ELs in our state, these state's consolidated plans will be referenced to illustrate how <b>Mississippi's is less than ideal for educators in our state.</b></p> <p>In Mississippi, it has been determined that students must obtain proficiency in English by year 5, which runs contrary to research specific to this field. In comparison to states with similar EL percentages, the length of time allocated to achieve ESL proficiency spans 7 years. Allowing two additional years for ELs in the state of Mississippi to achieve proficiency in acquiring English as a second language is one area in which we can do better.</p> <p>Additionally, Mississippi has determined that the n-count for ELs is 10. While in Alabama, this has been established at 20, and in Ohio, it is set at 15. In Mississippi, numerous districts do not have EL indicators wherein the accountability model does not have a detrimental impact on them as they do not have 5% of points deducted across components. While a percentage of these points (35 points for 700 pt. schools and 50pts. for 1000 pt. schools/districts) may be recaptured for schools/districts based on the percentage of ELs meeting growth measures per the progress to proficiency on the state's ELPT (Las Links), the fact that not all schools and districts begin with a point deficit highlights that our model is not equitable. Schools and districts with EL populations are penalized with our accountability ratings.</p> <p>To address this, consider how Ohio handles this. The Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency Indicator (referred to as English Language Proficiency Improvement Indicator) status is reported and measured independently; it then contributes to the Gap Closing component rating. New non regulatory guidance by U.S. Department of Education allows states to consider different growth expectations based on when a student enters school as an English learner and the student's initial language proficiency level. In doing so, the long-term state goals can establish high expectations for all English learners while acknowledging the varying needs of a diverse population and providing ambitious but truly attainable goals for each English learner student without penalizing schools/districts by lowering their accountability grade that is lambasted across all media platforms. This approach allows subgroup reporting to occur in determining school improvement initiatives per the federal government as deemed necessary. This does not undermine and demoralize the work of our teachers. It does not place letter grades on schools and districts for having an EL indicator.</p> <p>ELs are already measured and reported within the state's model in the areas of proficiency, growth, and LPS growth. Schools and districts feel the impact on scores by the inclusion of LPS growth in reading and math, overall growth in reading and math along with proficiency. To then turn around and carve out a category exclusive to the performance of English Language Learners is not a fair, supportive measure at all. We do not break out on the state's report card a measure exclusive to students with disabilities nor for students living in poverty. Why are we punishing schools and districts by singling out ELs?</p> <p>Please consider expanding the timeframe from 5 years to 7 years for students working towards the attainment of English as a Second Language. Please consider reporting EL Progress to Proficiency as an independent measure that is reported outside of the regular report card that assigns and publishes a letter grade for schools and districts. Use the independent measure and report for school intervention/improvement decisions only.</p> <p>Last but not least, provide the support from the state level to those districts that do have an EL indicator. While not all Mississippi districts participate in Title III funding, ALL districts are held to the same academic standards for ELs.</p> <p>We need to work smarter, not harder as a state to support our educators. Addressing this and correcting it would definitely be a huge step in the right direction. As a former principal whose campus in a previous district felt the significant impact of this at the onset of this model, this is a heartfelt plea on behalf of all in the field.</p> <p>Respectfully,                        Kelleigh Reynolds Broussard, Ed.S.                      Assistant Superintendent Long Beach School District</p>	<p>Long Beach School District</p>	<p>Kelleigh Reynolds Broussard Assistant Superintendent</p>	<p>August 4, 2023</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Alan Burrow:</p> <p>The changes to the language in the plan regarding English learners are clarifications of current accountability business rules and will not affect accountability measures.</p> <p>Mississippi is the lead participant in a multi-state research project to study appropriate measures of progress for EL students. The MDE plans to adjust measures based on the outcomes of this study when that data becomes available and final.</p> <p>Mississippi's n-count minimum of 10 is not uncommon among state accountability systems and works to ensure the inclusion of students in accountability measures. To increase the n-count minimum would potentially leave traditionally underserved subgroups out of accountability measures.</p> <p>Schools and districts are accountable for the populations they serve. These populations vary across the state and include variability in many aspects, not just EL populations.</p> <p>ESSA requires that EL Progress be included in measures used to identify schools for federal accountability purposes, and Mississippi law</p>

**Each respondent was sent a reply email confirming receipt of the submitted public comment. A copy of each submitted letter has been provided.**

Comment	Organization	Comment By	Date Received/Time	Method of Delivery	Response By
					requires one accountability system that meets both state and federal accountability requirements.
<p>August 4, 2023</p> <p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>While we have the opportunity to comment on the Mississippi Succeeds Consolidated Plan, it is vital that we look at the issue of ELs and include changes to support the educators in our state.</p> <p>Currently in Mississippi, all districts are held to the same academic standards for English learners; however, not all receive Title III funding to provide the extra resources needed to fulfill this task. Clearly, this warrants discussion and correction as this does not fairly provide to all districts across the state what is needed to accomplish what we are being asked to do.</p> <p>Also, it should be asked why we deduct points across accountability components used for reporting school and district performance when it only applies to some but not all districts in our state. Some schools and districts begin with a point deficit towards their summative score solely because of having an EL indicator. While we must report the performance of the EL subgroup for federal ESSA requirements, we are not dictated to as a state to take the approach we are utilizing. It seems unfair and lacks equity.</p> <p>Other states are implementing independent measures and reports without singling out this one subgroup on the report card used for accountability. It is worth researching what is being done elsewhere to support the hard work of teachers and administrators across the state in addition to addressing the timeline we have imposed for achieving proficiency in English as a second language.</p> <p>I don't want to take up too much of your time, but my concerns are simply this: our teachers and schools must have the resources necessary to support the second language acquisition of ELs; we need to have equity in applying an accountability model that does not penalize some; we need to expand the amount of time provided to acquire English as a second language.</p>	Long Beach School District	Talia Lock Superintendent	August 4, 2023	Email	<p>Alan Burrow: The changes to the language in the plan regarding English learners are clarifications of current accountability business rules and will not affect accountability measures. The EL Progress measure does not affect decisions on whether or not an EL student continues to receive services or enters monitoring status. These exit requirements are separate from the EL Progress measure in accountability, and were established as such to ensure that students receive EL services independently of the requirements to measure EL progress under ESSA.</p> <p>ESSA requires that EL Progress be included in measures used to identify schools for federal accountability purposes, and Mississippi law requires one accountability system that meets both state and federal accountability requirements.</p>

**Each respondent was sent a reply email confirming receipt of the submitted public comment. A copy of each submitted letter has been provided.**

Comment	Organization	Comment By	Date Received/Time	Method of Delivery	Response By
<p>If there is something I am missing or have misinterpreted regarding the impact that the EL component has on the accountability model or the funding, please don't hesitate to reach out to me. Thank you for your time.</p> <p>Your Partner in Education,                      Talia Lock                      Superintendent of the Long Beach School District</p>					
<p>The ATSI exit criteria for ATSI schools that were escalated to CSI should remain in its original format that was included in the MS Succeeds Plan.</p> <p>However, these schools should <b>also</b> be required to participate in rigorous professional learning opportunities where identifying and supporting subgroups is the focus.</p> <p>At the conclusion of these training sessions, each school should be required to develop a support/action plan with a corresponding instructional calendar for their identified subgroup (s) developed with stakeholder and district guidance.</p>	<p>Jackson Public School District</p>	<p>Deowarski McDonald School Improvement Manager</p>	<p>August 7, 2023</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Sonja Robertson:</p> <p>The Office of School Improvement is working with the Office of Special Education as well as the Region 7 Comprehensive Center to provide professional learning centered around the High Leverage Practices for supporting Students with disabilities and Students in Poverty.</p>

**Each respondent was sent a reply email confirming receipt of the submitted public comment. A copy of each submitted letter has been provided.**

Comment	Organization	Comment By	Date Received/Time	Method of Delivery	Response By
<p style="text-align: center;">August 7, 2023</p> <p>Dear MS Department of Education,</p> <p>In reviewing Mississippi's Consolidated State Plan, Mississippi Succeeds, there is an additional issue that we, as advocates for our students, feel should be addressed and a change made. It is the exit criteria for EL students.</p> <p>For the past several years, English Learners have been required to have a 4 or 5 as their overall score on the LAS LINKS English Language Proficiency Test, <b>as well as</b> a 4 or 5 in the domains of Reading and Writing on the test. For state accountability, however, it is only the <b>overall</b> score that is considered. Once a student achieves an overall score of 4, their future scores are no longer a part of District accountability for growth.</p> <p>This means that the student who makes an overall 4 or 5, but perhaps misses making the 4 or 5 in either Reading or Writing, does not get to exit the EL program even though there is no longer a growth goal for them to be working toward as far as school accountability is concerned. So, a student can make an overall 4 for several years without being able to exit which is an experience we have in our District. This is disheartening for students, parents and teachers and likely unnecessarily keeps students in the program.</p> <p>A level 4 or 5 means the student is proficient or above proficient. If they have achieved that overall score, but maybe have a 3 in reading or writing, it's possible that students in this category don't necessarily need further EL services, but maybe would benefit from Tier 2 classroom interventions and remaining in the regular classroom for peer interaction.</p> <p>This also ties into Long Term English Learners (LTELs). The definition of LTEL varies from state to state, but generally these are students who have been in English Learner programs for 5 or more years who still haven't been reclassified as proficient in English. There can be several reasons for students to be LTELs, but it could be the case that some students are in this category due to inappropriately stringent exit criteria.</p> <p>We understand that only taking the overall score into consideration may not be what we want to do, given the cognitive-academic aspect of reading and writing, and if that is the case, we have a <b>suggestion</b>. If the student has reached a level 4 or 5 overall on LAS LINKS, instead of requiring the student to get a 4 or 5 in BOTH reading &amp; writing, look at their <b>Literacy Score</b> (which is the combined Reading &amp; Writing scores.) If the Literacy score is a 4, then allow the student to exit, because frankly, a level 4 means they are proficient in the area of literacy.</p> <p>With respect, we ask that you please consider changing the exit criteria so that it is in line with accountability and reflects the hard work of students.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Jennifer J. Wright, NBCT, English as a New Language, Pontotoc County School District                  Beth Coghlan, Ph.D., NBCT, Middle Childhood Generalist, Pontotoc County School District                  Letty Ruiz, EL Teacher, Pontotoc County School District                  Susan Russell, EL Certified Teacher, Pontotoc County School District                  Tracy Harden, Pontotoc County School District                  Kimberly Tovar, EL assistant, Pontotoc County School District                  Pamela Holloway, EL assistant, Pontotoc County School District</p>	<p>Pontotoc County School District</p>	<p>Jennifer Wright Teacher</p>	<p>August 7, 2023</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Alan Burrow:</p> <p>The changes to the language in the plan regarding English learners are clarifications of current accountability business rules and will not affect accountability measures. The EL Progress measure does not affect decisions on whether or not an EL student continues to receive services or enters monitoring status. These exit requirements are separate from the EL Progress measure in accountability and were established as such to ensure that students receive EL services independently of the requirements to measure EL progress under ESSA.</p>



**Each respondent was sent a reply email confirming receipt of the submitted public comment. A copy of each submitted letter has been provided.**

Comment	Organization	Comment By	Date Received/Time	Method of Delivery	Response By
<p>As is current practice, students who move within performance level descriptor "3" have no opportunities to impact the accountability model. Suggestively, students who maintain the performance level descriptor of "3b" should be allotted a 0.25 as evidence of productivity across grade bands. Students who move within the performance level descriptor 3 from "3a" to "3b" should be allotted a 0.5 as evidence of growth as said students move across grade bands.</p>	<p>Laurel School District</p>	<p>Kristina Pollard, Chief Academic Officer                      Michael Eubanks, Assistant Superintendent;                      Heather Jones, Principal;                      Tirrase Bishop;                      Leander Bridges II, Principal;                      Brandi Calahan, Principal;                      Shanetra Addae, Principal;                      Dorsetta Jordan                      Exceptional Education Director</p>	<p>8/10/2023</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Alan Burrow: Off topic</p>
<p>We strongly recommend that the science component of the accountability model not be eliminated.</p>	<p>Laurel School District</p>	<p>Kristina Pollard, Chief Academic Officer                      Michael Eubanks, Assistant Superintendent;                      Heather Jones, Principal;                      Tirrase Bishop, Principal;                      Leander Bridges II, Principal;                      Brandi Calahan, Principal;                      Shanetra Addae,</p>	<p>8/10/2023</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>Alan Burrow:                      Agreed. There is no language in the plan that would remove Science from the accountability system.</p>

Each respondent was sent a reply email confirming receipt of the submitted public comment. A copy of each submitted letter has been provided.					
Comment	Organization	Comment By	Date Received/Time	Method of Delivery	Response By
		Principal; Dorsetta Jordan Exceptional Education Director			
Good afternoon, Please see the Pass Christian Public School District's response to the public comment on the Mississippi Succeeds Plan.	Pass Christian School District	Patty Cooper Chief Academic Officer	8/11/2023	Email	Sonja Robertson: The Offices of Student and District Performance, School Improvement, and Technology and Strategic Services are reviewing the exit criteria and will review the input provided toward consideration for changes to the ATSI to CSI escalation exit criteria.



**Each respondent was sent a reply email confirming receipt of the submitted public comment. A copy of each submitted letter has been provided.**

Comment	Organization	Comment By	Date Received/Time	Method of Delivery	Response By
 <p><b>Pass Christian School District</b> Office of the Superintendent &amp; Board of Trustees <i>Committed to Excellence</i></p> <p>August 11, 2023</p> <p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>On behalf of the Pass Christian Public School District, I am writing in response to the invitation by the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) to comment on the proposed amendments to the Mississippi Consolidated State Plan.</p> <p>First and foremost, I would like to convey my sincere gratitude to the MDE for initiating this collaborative process. Your commitment to transparency and inclusiveness in shaping the educational policies of our state is not only commendable but also vital in fostering an environment that reflects the needs and aspirations of our community.</p> <p>Upon a detailed examination of the revisions to the plan, I find myself in agreement with many of the proposed changes. However, there is one particular area that I feel warrants attention and refinement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support &amp; Improvement (CSI) and Additional Targeted Support &amp; Improvement (ATSI): The current plan could be enhanced by providing clear, stable end-of-year goals for exiting CSI and ATSI. The existing identification and exit criteria, which define the lowest-performing schools as those ranking in the bottom 5% of all Title IA schools, presents a variable target as the performance of these schools fluctuates annually. Establishing a stable, quantifiable target would provide schools with a more precise aim, fostering accountability, clarity, and continuous improvement.</li> </ul> <p>Your consideration of this suggestion is deeply appreciated. I believe that such an adjustment will further reinforce the robustness of the plan, aligning it more closely with the principles of fairness and objectivity.</p> <p>Thank you once again for the opportunity to engage in this essential dialogue. I look forward to seeing the positive changes that these amendments will bring to the educational landscape in Mississippi.</p> <p>Best regards,</p>  <p>Dr. Carla J. Evers</p> <p><b>Dr. Carla J. Evers, Superintendent of Schools</b> 6457 Kiln DeLisle Rd. • Pass Christian, MS 39571 • Office: 228.255.6200 • E-mail: cevers@pc.k12.ms.us</p>					



**Pass Christian School District**  
Office of the Superintendent & Board of Trustees  
*Committed to Excellence*

August 11, 2023

To Whom It May Concern:

On behalf of the Pass Christian Public School District, I am writing in response to the invitation by the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) to comment on the proposed amendments to the Mississippi Consolidated State Plan.

First and foremost, I would like to convey my sincere gratitude to the MDE for initiating this collaborative process. Your commitment to transparency and inclusiveness in shaping the educational policies of our state is not only commendable but also vital in fostering an environment that reflects the needs and aspirations of our community.

Upon a detailed examination of the revisions to the plan, I find myself in agreement with many of the proposed changes. However, there is one particular area that I feel warrants attention and refinement:

- Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support & Improvement (CSI) and Additional Targeted Support & Improvement (ATSI): The current plan could be enhanced by providing clear, stable end-of-year goals for exiting CSI and ATSI. The existing identification and exit criteria, which define the lowest-performing schools as those ranking in the bottom 5% of all Title IA schools, presents a variable target as the performance of these schools fluctuates annually. Establishing a stable, quantifiable target would provide schools with a more precise aim, fostering accountability, clarity, and continuous improvement.

Your consideration of this suggestion is deeply appreciated. I believe that such an adjustment will further reinforce the robustness of the plan, aligning it more closely with the principles of fairness and objectivity.

Thank you once again for the opportunity to engage in this essential dialogue. I look forward to seeing the positive changes that these amendments will bring to the educational landscape in Mississippi.

Best regards,



Dr. Carla J. Evers

**Dr. Carla J. Evers, Superintendent of Schools**

6457 Kiln DeLisle Rd. • Pass Christian, MS 39571 • Office: 228.255.6200 • E-mail: [cevers@pc.k12.ms.us](mailto:cevers@pc.k12.ms.us)

August 7, 2023

Dear MS Department of Education,

In reviewing Mississippi's Consolidated State Plan, Mississippi Succeeds, there is an additional issue that we, as advocates for our students, feel should be addressed and a change made. It is the exit criteria for EL students.

For the past several years, English Learners have been required to have a 4 or 5 as their overall score on the LAS LINKS English Language Proficiency Test, **as well as** a 4 or 5 in the domains of Reading and Writing on the test. For state accountability, however, it is only the **overall** score that is considered. Once a student achieves an overall score of 4, their future scores are no longer a part of District accountability for growth.

This means that the student who makes an overall 4 or 5, but perhaps misses making the 4 or 5 in either Reading or Writing, does not get to exit the EL program even though there is no longer a growth goal for them to be working toward as far as school accountability is concerned. So, a student can make an overall 4 for several years without being able to exit which is an experience we have in our District. This is disheartening for students, parents and teachers and likely unnecessarily keeps students in the program.

A level 4 or 5 means the student is proficient or above proficient. If they have achieved that overall score, but maybe have a 3 in reading or writing, it's possible that students in this category don't necessarily need further EL services, but maybe would benefit from Tier 2 classroom interventions and remaining in the regular classroom for peer interaction.

This also ties into Long Term English Learners (LTELs). The definition of LTEL varies from state to state, but generally these are students who have been in English Learner programs for 5 or more years who still haven't been reclassified as proficient in English. There can be several reasons for students to be LTELs, but it could be the case that some students are in this category due to inappropriately stringent exit criteria.

We understand that only taking the overall score into consideration may not be what we want to do, given the cognitive-academic aspect of reading and writing, and if that is the case, we have a **suggestion**. If the student has reached a level 4 or 5 overall on LAS LINKS, instead of requiring the student to get a 4 or 5 in BOTH reading & writing, look at their **Literacy Score** (which is the combined Reading & Writing scores.) If the Literacy score is a 4, then allow the student to exit, because frankly, a level 4 means they are proficient in the area of literacy.

With respect, we ask that you please consider changing the exit criteria so that it is in line with accountability and reflects the hard work of students.

Sincerely,

Jennifer J. Wright, NBCT, English as a New Language, Pontotoc County School District  
Beth Coghlan, Ph.D., NBCT, Middle Childhood Generalist, Pontotoc County School District  
Letty Ruiz, EL Teacher, Pontotoc County School District  
Susan Russell, EL Certified Teacher, Pontotoc County School District  
Tracy Harden, Pontotoc County School District  
Kimberly Tovar, EL assistant, Pontotoc County School District  
Pamela Holloway, EL assistant, Pontotoc County School District

Because the Amendment is still open, the redline changes are still visible. The table below identifies the current proposed updates that were addressed during the public comment period and the page number where each change can be found. No changes were made as a result of received public comments.

<b>Update</b>	<b>Location in Document</b>
EL score adjustment	P. 19
Explanation of additional weighting	P. 22
Remove Mississippi Science Test	P. 25
WorkKeys calculation method	P. 26
Explanation of additional weighting	P. 27
High Schools with missing components	P. 34
CSI exit criteria for methodology #3	P. 37



~~SEPTEMBER 2019~~  
APRIL 2023

# Mississippi Consolidated State Plan

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as  
amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act




U.S. Department of Education  
Issued: March 2017

Submitted: September 17, 2019 **Amended April 2023**

OMB Number: XX  
Expiration Date:

## COVER PAGE

Contact Information and Signatures	
<b>SEA Contact (Name and Position)</b> <del>Nathan Oakley, Ph.D.</del> <del>Chief Academic Officer</del> Sonja J. Robertson, Ph.D. Executive Director of School Improvement	<b>Telephone:</b> <del>601.359.3077</del> 601.359.1003
<b>Mailing Address:</b> P. O. Box 771 Jackson, MS 39205-0771	<b>Email Address:</b> <del>noakley@mdek12.org</del> srobertson@mdek12.org
By signing this document, I assure that: To the best of my knowledge and belief, all information and data included in this plan are true and correct. The SEA will submit a comprehensive set of assurances at a date and time established by the Secretary, including the assurances in ESEA section 8304. Consistent with ESEA section 8302(b)(3), the SEA will meet the requirements of ESEA sections 1117 and 8501 regarding the participation of private school children and teachers.	
<b>Authorized SEA Representative (Printed Name)</b> <del>Carey M. Wright, Ed.D.</del> Robert Taylor, Ed.D. Mike Kent Interim State Superintendent of Education	<b>Telephone:</b> 601.359.3512
<b>Signature of Authorized SEA Representative</b> 	<b>Date:</b> September 17, 2019 April 6, 2023
<b>Governor (Printed Name)</b> <del>Honorable Phil Bryant</del> Honorable Tate Reeves	<b>Date SEA provided plan to the Governor under ESEA section 8540: August 1, 2017</b>
<b>Signature of Governor</b>	<b>Date:</b>

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

COVER PAGE .....	2
LETTER FROM THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION .....	4
PROGRAMS INCLUDED IN THE CONSOLIDATED STATE PLAN .....	6
<b>A. TITLE I, PART A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>B. TITLE I, PART C: Education of Migratory Children .....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>C. TITLE I, PART D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk.....</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>D. TITLE II, PART A: Supporting Effective Instruction.....</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>E. TITLE III, PART A, SUBPART 1: English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement .....</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>F. TITLE IV, PART A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants.....</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>G. TITLE IV, PART B: 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers .....</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>H. TITLE V, PART B, SUBPART 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program.....</b>	<b>109</b>
<b>I. EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM, MCKINNEY-VENTO HOMELESS ASSISTANCE ACT, TITLE VII, SUBTITLE B .....</b>	<b>110</b>
APPENDIX A .....	119
APPENDIX B .....	129



## LETTER FROM THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION

---

April 6, 2023

The Honorable Miguel Cardona  
Secretary of U.S. Department of Education  
Lyndon Baines Johnson (LBJ) Department of Education Building  
400 Maryland Ave, SW  
Washington, DC 20202

Dear Mr. Secretary:

Mississippi is requesting to amend its approved consolidated state plan under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), to continue our work preparing all Mississippi students for college, career, and life.

When Mississippi submitted its initial Mississippi Succeeds plan in 2017 to meet the requirements of ESSA, the state's academic ranking was rising from the bottom tier of states. Since that time, student achievement has steadily increased, making Mississippi a national leader in improving academic outcomes. Mississippi's Quality Counts ranking for K-12 achievement has moved from 50th in 2013 to 35th in 2021, and our 4th graders now score at the national average on the National Assessment of Educational Progress. Mississippi students, families and educators are proud of what they have accomplished and are committed to achieving at higher levels. Mississippi's proposed amendment will enable the state to build upon our past progress toward improving opportunities and outcomes for all students.

Sincerely,

Mike Kent,  
Interim State Superintendent of Education

The Honorable Betsy DeVos  
Secretary of U.S. Department of Education  
Lyndon Baines Johnson (LBJ) Department of Education Building  
400 Maryland Ave, SW  
Washington, DC 20202

Dear Madam Secretary:

Mississippi students are achieving higher academic outcomes than ever before because the state has raised expectations for what they can accomplish. In every school across the state, students are proving there is no limit to what they can achieve.

Students are achieving more because Mississippi's leaders are committed to a singular vision of preparing our students for the future. The Mississippi State Board of Education, state elected leaders and the Mississippi Department of Education have joined forces to enact bold education reform efforts that are producing unprecedented outcomes. The changes have been aggressive, and teachers and administrators have embraced the state's vision to make major student achievement a reality.

Mississippi's plan for the Every Student Succeeds Act, called *Mississippi Succeeds*, builds upon the Mississippi State Board of Education's Strategic Plan and our state's long and proud history of nurturing talent and beating the odds. Our state currently ranks among the bottom tier of states academically, but Mississippians are propelling education forward. Our graduation rate has reached an all-time high, student gains on the National Assessment of Educational Progress have outpaced most other states, and Mississippi leaders have made significant investments in early childhood education, literacy, rigorous academic standards, advanced coursework opportunities for students, and professional development for teachers.

Our mission for education in Mississippi is to prepare our children for the jobs of the future and to be successful in careers that will lead our state forward. Innovation and economic development in Mississippi are creating opportunities for high-wage, high-demand jobs, and our schools must adjust to meet that demand.

Our *Mississippi Succeeds* plan will expand the state's education reform efforts to improve opportunities and outcomes for all students. Mississippi's future will be shaped by the students of today, and we are deeply committed to equipping them to learn, build, create, serve and innovate. We believe in the capacity of our students to achieve their highest goals and in the ability of our teachers and schools to guide them to a successful future.

Sincerely,



Carey M. Wright, Ed.D.  
State Superintendent



## PROGRAMS INCLUDED IN THE CONSOLIDATED STATE PLAN

*Instructions:* Indicate below by checking the appropriate box(es) which programs the SEA included in its consolidated State plan. If an SEA elected not to include one or more of the programs below in its consolidated State plan, but is eligible and wishes to receive funds under the program(s), it must submit individual program plans for those programs that meet all statutory and regulatory requirements with its consolidated State plan in a single submission.

Check this box if the SEA has included all of the following programs in its consolidated State plan.

or

If all programs are not included, check each program listed below that the SEA includes in its consolidated State plan:

- Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies
- Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children
- Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction
- Title III, Part A: English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement
- Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants
- Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers
- Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program
- Title VII, Subpart B of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act: Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program (McKinney-Vento Act)



## TITLE I, PART A

### Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)

*NOTE: Section A relates to Mississippi Board of Education (MBE) Strategic Plan Goals 1, 2, 5, and 6.*

#### 1. CHALLENGING STATE ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

*(ESEA section 1111(b)(1) and (2) and 34 CFR §§ 200.1–200.8)<sup>1</sup>*

#### 2. EIGHTH GRADE MATH EXCEPTION *(ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C) and 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4))*

- i. Does the State administer an end-of-course mathematics assessment to meet the requirements under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA?  
 Yes     No
  
- ii. If a State responds “yes” to question 2(i), does the State wish to exempt an eighth-grade student who takes the high school mathematics course associated with the end-of-course assessment from the mathematics assessment typically administered in eighth grade under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(aa) of the ESEA and ensure that:
  - a. The student instead takes the end-of-course mathematics assessment the State administers to high school students under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA;
  - b. The student’s performance on the high school assessment is used in the year in which the student takes the assessment for purposes of measuring academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) of the ESEA and participation in assessments under section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the ESEA;
  - c. In high school:
    1. The student takes a State-administered end-of-course assessment or nationally recognized high school academic assessment as defined in 34 CFR § 200.3(d) in mathematics that is more advanced than the assessment the State administers under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA;
    2. The State provides for appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR § 200.6(b) and (f); and
    3. The student’s performance on the more advanced mathematics assessment is used for purposes of measuring academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) of the ESEA and participation in assessments under section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the ESEA.  
 Yes     No

<sup>1</sup> The Secretary anticipates collecting relevant information consistent with the assessment peer review process in 34 CFR § 200.2(d). An SEA need not submit any information regarding challenging State academic standards and assessments at this time.

- iii. If a State responds “yes” to question 2(ii), consistent with 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4), describe, with regard to this exception, its strategies to provide all students in the State the opportunity to be prepared for and to take advanced mathematics coursework in middle school.

**3. NATIVE LANGUAGE ASSESSMENTS** *(ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(F) and 34 CFR § 200.6(f)(2)(ii))*

- i. Provide its definition for “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population,” and identify the specific languages that meet that definition.

Mississippi is an English-only state, as dictated by state law. (Mississippi Code 3-3-31 (2013) states “The English language is the official language of the State of Mississippi.”) According to the chart below which includes the five most represented languages other than English, Mississippi has yet to reach 3% of students speaking any language other than English. Mississippi is defining languages “present to a significant extent” as the most populous language other than English (currently Spanish), as well as any language for which 5% or more of students in tested grades speak the language.

Languages Other Than English			
LANGUAGE SPOKEN	NUMBER OF ENGLISH LEARNERS THAT SPEAK LANGUAGE	NUMBER OF ENGLISH LEARNERS IN TESTED GRADES THAT SPEAK LANGUAGE	PERCENTAGE OF MISSISSIPPI STUDENTS THAT SPEAK LANGUAGE
<b>Spanish</b>	8,243	4,813	1.69%
<b>Arabic</b>	480	286	0.09%
<b>Vietnamese</b>	277	176	0.05%
<b>Chinese</b>	223	118	0.04%
<b>Gujarati</b>	85	49	0.02%

Given that many of Mississippi’s students who have a native language other than English do not have strong academic vocabulary in their native language due to interruption in formal schooling or lack of prior formal education, MDE’s Office of Student Assessment creates state assessments in English only.

- ii. Identify any existing assessments in languages other than English, and specify for which grades and content areas those assessments are available.

Mississippi does not offer existing assessments in languages other than English.

- iii. Indicate the languages identified in question 3(i) for which yearly student academic assessments are not available and are needed.

There are no languages for which assessments are not available and are needed, based on 3(i).

- iv. Describe how it will make every effort to develop assessments, at a minimum, in languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population including by providing
  - a. The State's plan and timeline for developing such assessments, including a description of how it met the requirements of 34 CFR § 200.6(f)(4);
  - b. A description of the process the State used to gather meaningful input on the need for assessments in languages other than English, collect and respond to public comment, and consult with educators; parents and families of English learners; students, as appropriate; and other stakeholders; and
  - c. As applicable, an explanation of the reasons the State has not been able to complete the development of such assessments despite making every effort.

As described in 3(i), there are no languages other than English present to a significant extent. Assessments are not being developed in other languages.

#### **4. STATEWIDE ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM AND SCHOOL SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES** *(ESEA section 1111(c) and (d))*

##### **i. SUBGROUPS** *(ESEA section 1111(c)(2):*

- a. List each major racial and ethnic group the State includes as a subgroup of students, consistent with ESEA section 1111(c)(2)(B).

Mississippi collects and reports assessment results consistent with 1111(h). Subgroup data is evaluated to identify performance gaps and target support schools for the following subgroups:

- Economically disadvantaged students
- Students with disabilities
- English learners (ELs)
- Alaskan Native or Native American

- Asian
- Black or African-American
- Hispanic / Latino
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- White
- Two or More Races

Subgroup proficiency data will be used as a means of identifying schools for Targeted Support and Improvement.

- b. If applicable, describe any additional subgroups of students other than the statutorily required subgroups (*i.e.*, economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, children with disabilities, and English learners) used in the Statewide accountability system.

The Mississippi school system is predominantly a rural school system with many small schools. Although the state Legislature has been working to consolidate small schools and districts, the median school size in 2015-16 was still only 475 students. In order to ensure that all subgroups are accounted for in the accountability system, Mississippi also identifies and targets the lowest performing 25% of students based on statewide assessments in its accountability model. This method highlights low-performing students, regardless of their subgroup characteristics. Because Mississippi tends to have low n-counts in subgroup data, this allows more students to be accounted for in reporting potentially disadvantaged groups. For example, Mississippi's public-school system is majority economically disadvantaged, but more than 30% of schools do not have at least 10 EL students. Focusing on the lowest performing students and weighting them heavily in the accountability model has forced districts to identify at-risk students for intervention and includes more students traditionally identified as disadvantaged in the accountability model. Since implementing the inclusion of the lowest 25% indicator, Mississippi has shown significant gains as evident in our 2015 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) results.

- c. Does the State intend to include in the English learner subgroup the results of students previously identified as English learners on the State assessments required under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) for purposes of State accountability (ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(B))? Note that a student's results may be included in the English learner subgroup for not more than four years after the student ceases to be identified as an English learner.

Yes    No

- d. If applicable, choose one of the following options for recently arrived English learners in the State:
- Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i); or
  - Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii);** or
  - Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i) or under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii). If this option is selected, describe how the State will choose which exception applies to a recently arrived English learner.

**NOTE:** Recently arrived English learners have been enrolled in a school in one of the 50 States in the United States or the District of Columbia for less than 12 months.

ii. **MINIMUM N-SIZE (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A))**

- a. Provide the minimum number of students that the State determines are necessary to be included to carry out the requirements of any provisions under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that require disaggregation of information by each subgroup of students for accountability purposes.

The minimum number of students used in Mississippi's accountability system measures is 10.

- b. Describe how the minimum number of students is statistically sound.

By taking a population perspective in its accountability system, Mississippi does not use statistical sampling in accountability data, rather the full population is used. Given the large number of small schools within Mississippi, using an n-count of 10 ensures maximum inclusion of students in the accountability system without undermining student privacy.

- c. Describe how the minimum number of students was determined by the State, including how the State collaborated with teachers, principals, other school leaders, parents, and other stakeholders when determining such minimum number.

In the Fall of 2012, the Mississippi State Board of Education convened the Mississippi Accountability Task Force to assess and evaluate the quality, accuracy, and transparency of Mississippi's High School Completion Index and its use in the Mississippi Performance Accountability System (MPAS). The Task Force's focus quickly changed to a complete revision of the MPAS. This was largely due to pending legislation, which represented a major revision to the system. The Task Force members included classroom teachers, superintendents, assistant superintendents, and district test coordinators, as well as a representative of the State Board of Education and leaders of the Mississippi Legislature.



During the 18-month process, all meetings of the Task Force were held as open (public) meetings and included opportunities for members of the public to make suggestions and offer thoughts during the meeting. This process was substantially more transparent than the process used to develop the previous system in 2007-2008.

After the "framework" of the revised system was built, a technical advisory committee (TAC) was established to develop and determine the procedural and statistical components of the system. Every meeting of the TAC was open to the public and the meetings were normally well attended by interested individuals and groups from the public. When the TAC completed its work, the revised system was presented to the original Task Force for its approval (public meeting). Following the Task Force's approval, the revised system was presented to the State Commission on Accreditation (public meeting), which recommended the system for approval by the State Board of Education. Upon State Board approval, the system underwent Mississippi's Administrative Procedures Act process as is normal for all State Board of Education policy.

Before ESEA Flexibility, Mississippi's accountability system required an n-count of 40 for data to be included for a given subgroup. Under the old Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) model, 74% of the schools in Mississippi were not held accountable for the students with disabilities (IEP) subgroup, due to having an n-count fewer than 40; likewise, 98% of the schools were not held accountable for the EL subgroup. Under the new model, less than 2% of schools had fewer than 10 students in the "low 25%" subgroup during the 2015-16 school year.

- d. Describe how the State ensures that the minimum number is sufficient to not reveal any personally identifiable information.<sup>2</sup>

When the number of students reporting scores is below 10, scores are suppressed. Also, any percentage value below 5% or higher than 95% is suppressed for subgroup data. Larger aggregates, such as graduation rate and participation rate at the school or district level are suppressed at less

---

<sup>2</sup> Consistent with ESEA section 1111(i), information collected or disseminated under ESEA section 1111 shall be collected and disseminated in a manner that protects the privacy of individuals consistent with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g, commonly known as the "Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974"). When selecting a minimum n-size for reporting, States should consult the Institute for Education Sciences report "[Best Practices for Determining Subgroup Size in Accountability Systems While Protecting Personally Identifiable Student Information](#)" to identify appropriate statistical disclosure limitation strategies for protecting student privacy.

than 5%.

- e. If the State's minimum number of students for purposes of reporting is lower than the minimum number of students for accountability purposes, provide the State's minimum number of students for purposes of reporting.

Minimum reporting value is also 10.

**iii. ESTABLISHMENT OF LONG-TERM GOALS (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A))**

**a. ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(aa))**

1. Describe the long-term goals for improved academic achievement, as measured by proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments, for all students and for each subgroup of students, including: (1) the timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State, and (2) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

Mississippi leaders and stakeholders in the ESSA Advisory Committee believe that a 10-year timeline for long-term goals is appropriate, as 3rd graders in the first year of data will be 12<sup>th</sup> graders in final year of data (year 10), when college and career readiness is reported. Furthermore, these stakeholders identified a long-term goal of 70% of students achieving proficiency in reading/language arts and mathematics as representing ambitious but attainable goals because the increase in proficiency rates over time seemed appropriate. This long-term goal will more than double proficiency rates for all students and most subgroups over the time period in both reading/language arts and mathematics.

Using subgroup performance data from the Mississippi Assessment Program administered to students during the 2015-16 school term, the MDE calculated baseline proficiency rates for the following racial/ethnic subgroups:

- Alaskan Native or Native American,
- Asian,
- Black or African American,
- Hispanic/Latino,
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander,
- White, and
- Two or More Races.

Additionally, baseline proficiency rates were calculated for the following subgroups:

- English Learners,
- ~~Special Education~~ Students with Disabilities, and
- Low-Income.

~~Given that Mississippi has only administered its current state assessment for a single year a~~ A linear growth model was used to project long-term goals and interim measures. Goals and interim measures are provided in Appendix A.

READING/LANGUAGE ARTS PROFICIENCY		
SUBGROUPS	BASELINE DATA	LONG-TERM GOAL
	2015-16	<del>2024-25</del> 2026-27
All students	32.6%	70.0%
Economically disadvantaged students	24.4%	70.0%
Students with disabilities	8.9%	70.0%
English learners	13.6%	70.0%
Alaskan Native or Native American	28.0%	70.0%
Asian	57.7%	70.0%
Black or African American	18.9%	70.0%
Hispanic/Latino	28.4%	70.0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	48.9%	70.0%
White	47.5%	70.0%
Two or More Races	37.3%	70.0%

MATHEMATICS PROFICIENCY		
SUBGROUPS	BASELINE DATA	LONG-TERM GOAL
	2015-16	<del>2024-25</del> 2026-27
All students	31.1%	70.0%
Economically disadvantaged students	23.1%	70.0%
Students with disabilities	9.1%	70.0%
English learners	22.9%	70.0%

MATHEMATICS PROFICIENCY		
SUBGROUPS	BASELINE DATA	LONG-TERM GOAL
	2015-16	<del>2024-25</del> 2026-27
Alaskan Native or Native American	26.2%	70.0%
Asian	68.3%	70.0%
Black or African American	17.4%	70.0%
Hispanic/Latino	32.9%	70.0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	48.1%	70.0%
White	45.2%	70.0%
Two or More Races	36.2%	70.0%

2. Provide the measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for academic achievement in Appendix A.
  
3. Describe how the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for academic achievement take into account the improvement necessary to make significant progress in closing statewide proficiency gaps.

Once subgroup baseline rates were calculated, subgroup proficiency rates were reviewed to examine gaps between different student subgroups. The Black student subgroup consistently had a significantly lower proficiency rate than the All students group. Because the Black student subgroup is the largest subgroup of students in Mississippi, this group was selected as the comparison group for setting ambitious but achievable goals that will result in achievement gap closure. As a long-term goal, Mississippi aims to eliminate the proficiency gap between Black students and All students entirely, as the All students proficiency rate increases to 70% by ~~2025~~ 2027.

Three-year interim measures, as provided in Appendix A, were identified, using data from 2018-19, 2021-22, and ~~2024-25~~, as a means of determining progress toward long-term goals.

**b. GRADUATION RATE (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(bb))**

1. Describe the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and for each subgroup of students, including: (1) the

timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State, and (2) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

The leaders and stakeholders of Mississippi’s ESSA Advisory Committee used a similar 10-year time horizon and linear growth trajectory, finding it to be appropriately ambitious for schools and districts across the state.

Using subgroup four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate data from the cohort of students who graduated during the 2015-16 school term, the MDE calculated baseline graduation rates for the following racial/ethnic subgroups:

- Alaskan Native or Native American,
- Asian,
- Black or African American,
- Hispanic/Latino,
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander,
- White, and
- Two or More Races.

Additionally, baseline graduation rates were calculated for the following subgroups:

- English Learners,
- ~~Special Education~~ **Students with Disabilities**, and
- Low-Income.

GRADUATION RATE		
SUBGROUPS	BASELINE DATA	LONG-TERM GOAL
	2015-16	<del>2024-25</del> 2026-27
All students	82.3%	90.0%
Economically disadvantaged students	78.8%	88.5%
Students with disabilities	34.7%	70.0%
English learners	55.9%	78.9%
Alaskan Native or Native American	87.5%	92.2%
Asian	92.6%	94.3%
Black or African American	78.9%	88.6%
Hispanic/Latino	81.8%	89.8%

GRADUATION RATE		
SUBGROUPS	BASELINE DATA	LONG-TERM GOAL
	2015-16	<del>2024-25</del> 2026-27
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	77.8%	88.1%
White	85.8%	91.5%
Two or More Races	78.2%	88.3%

2. If applicable, describe the long-term goals for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, including (1) the timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State; (2) how the long-term goals are ambitious; and (3) how the long-term goals are more rigorous than the long-term goal set for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.

Mississippi does not use an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.

3. Provide the measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate in Appendix A.
4. Describe how the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate take into account the improvement necessary to make significant progress in closing statewide graduation rate gaps.

Once subgroup baseline rates were calculated, subgroup graduation rates were reviewed to examine gaps between different student subgroups. The **Special Education students with disabilities subgroup** consistently had a significantly lower graduation rate than the All students group. Because this subgroup had the largest gap when compared to All students in Mississippi, this group was selected as a comparison group for graduation gap closure calculations.

As a long-term goal, Mississippi aims to close the graduation rate gap between Special Education students and All students. This gap will be reduced to 20%, as the All students graduation rate increases to 90% by ~~2025~~ 2027. This goal would more than double the current graduation rate for Special Education (from 34.7% to 70%) while

also increasing the graduation rate for All students to a historic level of 90%. For any subgroup with a baseline proficiency rate at or above 90%, it is expected that the subgroup will maintain or exceed their baseline rate each year.

**c. ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii))**

1. Describe the long-term goals for English learners for increases in the percentage of such students making progress in achieving English language proficiency, as measured by the statewide English language proficiency assessment, including: (1) the State-determined timeline for such students to achieve English language proficiency and (2) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

The MDE leadership analyzed LAS Links scores and guidance in understanding that English language proficiency is not acquired in a linear progression.

EL PROGRAM EXIT CRITERIA	
PROFICIENCY LEVEL	SCORE REQUIREMENTS
Level 4 or 5	Overall Score + Reading Score (4 or higher) + Writing Score (4 or higher)

When new ELP standards are in place and assessments have been determined to be aligned, the exit criteria for English learners may need to be adjusted. This adjustment will happen after the 2017-18 school term when the accountability system is revisited, after three years of consistent implementation.

For the calculation of progress toward English language proficiency, students are assigned an annual target score based on their initial year **composite score on the** ~~of~~ ELP assessment and the corresponding score required to meet ~~exit criteria~~ **overall proficiency** in five years or less. Students will be awarded points (between 0 and 1) in direct proportion to the progress made toward this annual target.

Step 1: Calculate annual target score.

$$\frac{\text{Exit Overall Score Required} - \text{Prior Year Score}}{\text{Years Remaining in Timeline to Exit}} + \text{Prior Year Score} = \text{Annual Target Score}$$

Step 2: Calculate points earned for each student.

$$\frac{\text{Current Year Score}}{\text{Annual Target Score}} = \text{Points Earned}$$

A student meeting or exceeding progress would earn a score of 1, while a student making half of the expected progress would earn a score of 0.5. A student who regresses or earns the same score as the prior year will earn a score of 0.

Within a school, the average score is calculated for all EL students. This average score is multiplied ~~by to allow for~~ a maximum of 35 points in the accountability model for schools without 12<sup>th</sup> grade, or a maximum of 50 points in the accountability for schools that include 12<sup>th</sup> grade. **This resulting score is adjusted such that a school average student rate of 0.9 or higher shall receive the maximum points for this indicator. This adjustment is applied uniformly to all other averages, effectively increasing each value by 10 percent.**

The EL indicator will carry a weight of 5% of the overall accountability model, which is appropriate for Mississippi schools, as less than 3% of Mississippi students are classified as ELs statewide.

It is anticipated that within 10 years, 70% of ELs will make adequate growth within the time period identified as appropriate based on their initial ELP level. Goals and interim measures are provided in Appendix A.

2. Provide the measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency in Appendix A.

**iv. INDICATORS** (*ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)*)

**a. ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT INDICATOR**

Describe the Academic Achievement indicator, including a description of how the indicator (i) is based on the long-term goals; (ii) is measured by proficiency on the annual Statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments; (iii) annually measures academic achievement for all students and separately for each subgroup of students; and (iv) at the State's discretion, for each public high school in the State, includes a measure of student growth, as measured by the annual Statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments.



Mississippi's academic achievement indicator is based on proficiency scores as measured by the Mississippi Academic Assessment Program (MAAP) for grades 3-8 in reading/language arts and mathematics and by secondary end-of course assessments in English II and Algebra I **or an approved Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Assessment as described in Miss. Admin. Code 7-3: 78.11, State Board Policy Chapter 78, Rule 78.11 Guidelines for Mississippi's Implementation of the Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized, High School Assessment.** The new MAAP is consistent with the rigor of the NAEP assessment and aligned with the skills and knowledge articulated in the Mississippi College- and Career-Readiness Standards. The assessments' items/tasks (a) align to the targeted content standards, (b) extend across a range of cognitive demand; and, (c) use different formats to maximize a student's ability to demonstrate his/her full understanding of the standards. Empirical evidence suggests a unidimensional, latent construct is being measured and reported in the overall score. Further, the scores are highly stable with low measurement errors for both the overall population and for identified subgroups of students.

Proficiency is calculated by dividing the total number of full academic year (FAY) students (overall or by subgroup) meeting proficiency on the reading/language arts or math assessment by the total number of FAY students testing in that school/district. Proficiency is defined as achievement level four or five on the five-level reading/language arts and math assessments. In the event that a school or district tests less than 95% of FAY students (or 95% of each subgroup) in reading or math, the denominator is increased to 95% of FAY students in the calculation of proficiency. The denominator will be the greater of 95% or all FAY students.

Scores of students taking Algebra I or English II end-of-course assessments in a grade below 10th grade will be "banked" for proficiency/achievement and growth calculations until the student is in the 10th grade and then applied to the student's 10th grade school (if the student met FAY requirements the year he/she was assessed and during his/her 10th grade year).

These reading/language arts and math tests annually measure proficiency for all students and subgroups. Performance for all students is included in the accountability model. Subgroup performance is reported by the categories described in A.4.a of this document in order to identify performance gaps and will be used to identify Targeted Support and Improvement schools.

In high schools, Mississippi uses growth for all students and growth among the lowest quartile as another academic achievement indicator for all public-school students. Assessments used for the calculation of growth in high schools include end-of-course assessments in reading/language arts (English II) and mathematics (Algebra I) **or an approved Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Assessment as described in Miss. Admin. Code 7-3: 78.11, State Board Policy Chapter 78, Rule 78.11 Guidelines for Mississippi's Implementation of the Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized, High School Assessment.**

Students taking Algebra I in 7th or 8th grade are required to also take the grade-level assessment in mathematics. Therefore, these students have two growth calculations: grade-level to grade-level and grade-level to Algebra I. The grade-level to grade-level growth calculations are applied to the current school. The grade-level to Algebra I growth calculations are banked until the student's 10th grade year.

A full description of growth is included in the response below, as growth is calculated consistently across grades and subjects.

**b. INDICATOR FOR PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS THAT ARE NOT HIGH SCHOOLS (OTHER ACADEMIC INDICATOR)**

Describe the Other Academic indicator, including how it annually measures the performance for all students and separately for each subgroup of students. If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, the description must include a demonstration that the indicator is a valid and reliable statewide academic indicator that allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance.

Mississippi has one Other Academic Indicator. Growth is measured in reading/language arts and mathematics growth for all students with additional weight being placed on students performing in the lowest quartile.

**GROWTH**

The current Mississippi growth model incentivizes schools to move all students to the next level of reading/language arts or math proficiency regardless of their current level and penalizes schools that allow a student's proficiency level to drop. This indicator is measured annually. In the Mississippi model, the school gets as much credit for moving a student from Performance Level 1 (Minimal) to Performance Level 2 (Basic) as for moving a student from Performance Level 2 to Performance Level 3 (Pass). Likewise, if a student slides from Performance Level 2 to Performance Level 1, the school loses as much as a student sliding from Performance Level 5 (Advanced) to Performance Level 4 (Proficient).

Academic growth is measured by the MAAP for grades 3-8 reading/language arts and mathematics.

Growth is determined by whether or not a student increases in performance/proficiency levels from one year to the next based on the following criteria:

- An increase of ANY performance/proficiency level,
- Staying at the same performance/proficiency that is at or above Proficient from one year to the next, or
- An increase within the lowest three performance/proficiency levels that crosses over the mid-point of the level.

Additional weight in the numerator is given for the following increases:

- Any increase of two or more performance/proficiency levels will be given a weight = 1.25.
- Any increase to the highest performance/proficiency level will be given a weight = 1.25.
- **Maintaining the highest performance/proficiency level from one year to the next will be given a weight = 1.25.**
- **Because of the above described additional weighting, growth scores may exceed the 95 or 100 points assigned to a growth indicator.**

The denominator for the growth calculation includes any FAY student with two (2) valid assessment scores (as defined above). The numerator will include any student included in the denominator who has demonstrated growth as defined above, and weighted accordingly.

Assessments currently used for the calculation of growth include:

- Grade-level (3-8) assessments in English Language Arts;
- Grade-level (3-8) assessments in Mathematics;
- Alternate Assessments (3-8) in English Language Arts; and
- Alternate Assessments (3-8) in Mathematics.

If a student does not have the previous year's grade-level assessment, the student is excluded from the growth calculation(s).

For K-3 schools, growth of 4th grade students in the district is used for the growth calculations of the K-3 school in which they met FAY. Explanations of growth calculations for schools with other non-tested grade configurations may be found in A.4.v.c.

Mississippi also measures the reading/language arts and math growth of the lowest-performing students as a part of growth calculations, placing additional weight on this group of students. This is a consistent measure

across elementary, middle, and high schools (as described in Academic Achievement) in the State. Additional weight on this lowest quartile growth forces schools to focus on at-risk students regardless of their demographic or curricular subgroup. Mississippi, as well as other states that have used this indicator, has shown gains in the NAEP results and positive movement in closing performance gaps.

The Lowest-Performing Students subgroup in ELA and the Lowest-Performing Students subgroup in mathematics are determined using the same method as growth for all students. The procedure used to identify the lowest-performing students in a school is applied separately by grade, and the identified students are combined across all grades to comprise the Lowest-Performing Students subgroup and to determine learning gains. If the minimum n-count is not met, all students except those performing at the highest proficiency level are included. If the minimum n-count is still not met, the full population of students is used for the lowest 25% growth indicator. In the 2015-16 school year, less than 2% of schools had fewer than 10 students included in the Lowest-Performing subgroup. Using the lowest quartile ensures the inclusion of the maximum number of students in the accountability model.

**c. GRADUATION RATE**

Describe the Graduation Rate indicator, including a description of (i) how the indicator is based on the long-term goals; (ii) how the indicator annually measures graduation rate for all students and separately for each subgroup of students; (iii) how the indicator is based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate; (iv) if the State, at its discretion, also includes one or more extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates, how the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is combined with that rate or rates within the indicator; and (v) if applicable, how the State includes in its four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates students with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed using an alternate assessment aligned to alternate academic achievement standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(D) and awarded a State-defined alternate diploma under ESEA section 8101(23) and (25).

The federal four-year, adjusted cohort graduation rate is included as another academic indicator for high schools. This indicator is weighted heavily at 200 points, and only students who meet the definition of a graduate in 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1) earn points for the school/district. No five-year or other extended graduation rate is calculated for use in the accountability system. This indicator annually measures graduation rates for all students. Mississippi's long-term goals for graduation for all students and subgroups are based on this measure as well. Since the implementation of the current accountability model, graduation rates have increased from 74.5 to 82.3 for the all students group.

Once subgroup baseline graduation rates were calculated, subgroup graduation rates were reviewed to examine gaps between different student subgroups. The ~~Special Education students with disabilities subgroup~~ consistently had a significantly lower graduation rate than the All students group. Because this subgroup had the largest gap when compared to All students in Mississippi, this group was selected as a target group for graduation gap closure.

Mississippi will assess students with the most significant cognitive disabilities through an alternate assessment aligned to alternate academic achievement standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(D), and resulting in a State-defined alternate diploma as allowed under ESEA section 8101(23) and (25). The course of study for the Mississippi Alternate Diploma is aligned to the Mississippi Traditional Diploma course requirements, however the work of the student can be significantly modified to meet the needs of the individual student. The student's IEP Committee will determine the necessary modifications the student needs in order to show mastery of the standards. Students may either take a modified version of any general education course that counts towards a traditional diploma or courses aligned to the alternate achievement standards adopted by the State Board of Education. ~~Pending approval from the Mississippi Board of Education and a technical amendment to Mississippi Code, Annotated § 37-17-6(5)(c)(iii);~~ Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities meeting the requirements of the Mississippi Alternate Diploma shall be defined as graduates for the purposes of accountability calculation.

**d. PROGRESS IN ACHIEVING ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY (ELP) INDICATOR**

Describe the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator, including the State's definition of ELP, as measured by the State ELP assessment.

English Language Proficiency is defined as ~~the following scores on LAS Links: an overall score of 4-5, Reading 4-5, and Writing 4-5.~~

For the calculation of progress toward English language proficiency, students are assigned an annual target score based on their initial year of ELP assessment and the corresponding score required to ~~reach overall proficiency on the ELP assessment~~ ~~meet exit criteria~~ in five years or less.

The EL indicator will carry a weight of 5% of the overall accountability model, which is appropriate for Mississippi schools, as less than 3% of Mississippi students are classified as ELs statewide.

**e. SCHOOL QUALITY OR STUDENT SUCCESS INDICATOR(S)**

Describe each School Quality or Student Success Indicator, including, for each such indicator: (i) how it allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance; (ii) that it is valid, reliable, comparable, and statewide (for the grade span(s) to which it applies); and (iii) of how each such indicator annually measures performance for all students and separately for each subgroup of students. For any School Quality or Student Success indicator that does not apply to all grade spans, the description must include the grade spans to which it does apply.

**SCIENCE AND SOCIAL STUDIES PROFICIENCY**

Science proficiency is measured by the **Mississippi Science Test Mississippi Academic Assessment Program (MAAP)** in grades 5 and 8 and by the Biology I end-of-course exam in high school **or an approved Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Assessment as described in Miss. Admin. Code 7-3: 78.11, State Board Policy Chapter 78, Rule 78.11 Guidelines for Mississippi's Implementation of the Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized, High School Assessment.** Social studies proficiency in high school is measured by the U.S. History end-of-course exam **or an approved Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Assessment as described in Miss. Admin. Code 7-3: 78.11, State Board Policy Chapter 78, Rule 78.11 Guidelines for Mississippi's Implementation of the Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized, High School Assessment.** As with reading/language arts and math proficiency, science and social studies proficiency is calculated by dividing the total number of FAY students meeting proficiency on the science or social studies assessment by the total number of FAY students testing in that school/district. Proficiency is currently defined as achievement level three or four on the four-level science and social studies assessments. As these assessments move to a five-level system of performance, proficiency will be defined as level four or five.

Scores of students taking the Biology I assessment in a grade below 10th grade will be “banked” for proficiency/achievement until the student is in the 10th grade and then applied to the student’s 10th grade school (if the student met FAY requirements the year he/she was assessed and during his/her 10th grade year). All science and social studies tests annually measure proficiency for all students and subgroups. Performance for all students is included in the accountability model.

At schools with a 12<sup>th</sup> grade (i.e. high schools), two additional Student Success indicators are used: a College & Career Readiness (CCR) indicator and an Acceleration indicator.

The CCR indicator is calculated from performance on the ACT **or ACT WorkKeys Certification.** The Mississippi Legislature provides funding for

all junior-year high school students to take the ACT assessment in a statewide administration. LEAs are also able to report and include higher scores than those earned on the statewide administration in this calculation. Seniors that have been enrolled in a Mississippi public school, at least since 10<sup>th</sup> grade, are used as the population for the CCR indicator. For this population, the percentage of students meeting English or reading ACT benchmarks is calculated and multiplied by 23.75. That result is added to the percentage of students meeting math ACT benchmarks multiplied by 23.75 for a total of 48 points in the accountability model. ACT College Readiness Benchmarks are published by ACT; the benchmarks are currently 18 in English, 22 in Reading, and 22 in Math. ACT develops the benchmarks as a measure of minimum performance on the ACT in each subject area for students to have a reasonable chance of being successful in a first-year credit-bearing college course at a typical college. ~~Students may also meet the CCR indicator by achieving a Silver level National Career Readiness Certificate (NCRC) administered through the ACT WorkKeys assessment and successfully complete an industry certification or career pathway, or achieve a Gold or Platinum NCRC. Students that meet the WorkKeys requirement are included in the CCR measure in the same manner as a student that meets both English or reading and math ACT benchmarks. Students may not exceed 1.0 in the numerator of the average calculation. By including these benchmarks in accountability measures, high schools can be differentiated on whether or not they prepare students for success in college-level courses. Based on data from 2016-17, points earned on this indicator ranged from 0.6 points to 34.8 points.~~

The Acceleration indicator refers to the percentage of students taking and passing the assessment associated with accelerated courses such as Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), Advanced International Certificate of Education (AICE), or MBE-approved industry certification courses. For students taking dual credit and dual enrollment courses, passing refers to students who are passing the course with a “C” or above. For AP courses, the student must score at least 3 on the AP exam. For IB courses, the student must score at least 4 on the IB exam. For AICE courses, the student must obtain a passing score on the exam. (Passing scores of “A”, “B”, “C”, “D”, and “E” on the AICE exams are not based on the American “A-F” grading scale.) For industry certification courses, the student must pass the exam. College courses must be credit-bearing courses with a minimum of three (3) semester hours of credit and may be in any subject/content area. The Acceleration component consists of a Participation and a Performance component, which are combined for one (1) score worth fifty (50) points. Specific details of the calculation are provided below. Within the component, 23.75 points are earned from Participation, and 23.75 points are earned from Performance. Based on

data from 2016-17, points earned on this indicator ranged from 0.5 points to 37.6 points.

The numerator for the Participation component calculation is the number of students taking accelerated courses such as AP, IB, AICE, dual credit, dual enrollment, or industry certification courses based on the definition above.

The denominator for the Participation component calculation includes all students whose Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS) grade or peer-grade equivalent is 11th or 12th grade plus any 9th or 10th grade students who are taking and passing these assessments/courses. Students participating in multiple accelerated courses during the same school year are given additional weighting in the numerator as follows:

- 2 courses: 1.1
- 3 courses: 1.2
- 4 courses: 1.3
- 5 courses: 1.4

The numerator for the Performance component calculation is the number of students taking and passing accelerated assessments/courses such as AP, IB, AICE, dual credit, dual enrollment, or industry certification courses based on the definition above.

The denominator for the Performance component calculation consists of all students participating in the courses and/or tests identified in the participation calculations.

Students who are enrolled in accelerated courses but do not take the required assessment will be considered as “not proficient” in the performance calculations.

**Because of the above described additional weighting, scores may exceed the 47.5 or 50 points assigned to the indicator.**

**v. ANNUAL MEANINGFUL DIFFERENTIATION** (*ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C)*)

- a.** Describe the State’s system of annual meaningful differentiation of all public schools in the State, consistent with the requirements of section 1111(c)(4)(C) of the ESEA, including a description of (i) how the system is based on all indicators in the State’s accountability system, (ii) for all students and for each subgroup of students. Note that each state must comply with the requirements in 1111(c)(5) of the ESEA with respect to accountability for charter schools.



The following tables illustrate the components that make up Mississippi’s accountability model:

ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS			
READING	MATH	SCIENCE	ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRESS
Proficiency <b>95 PTS</b>	Proficiency <b>95 PTS</b>	Proficiency <b>95 PTS</b>	
Growth All Students <b>95 PTS</b>	Growth All Students <b>95 PTS</b>		
Growth Lowest 25% <b>95 PTS</b>	Growth Lowest 25% <b>95 PTS</b>		
			Progress to Proficiency <b>35 PTS</b>
<b>700 POINTS POSSIBLE</b>			

**NOTE:** Participation is measured in each subject. See more in A.4.vii.

DISTRICTS AND SCHOOLS WITH 12TH GRADE						
READING	MATH	OTHER SUBJECTS	GRADUATION 4-YEAR	ACCELERATION	COLLEGE & CAREER READINESS	ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRESS
Proficiency <b>95 PTS</b>	Proficiency <b>95 PTS</b>	Science Proficiency <b>47.5 PTS</b>	4-year Cohort Rate <b>190 PTS</b>	Performance <b>19 PTS (2016-17)</b> <b>23.75 PTS (2017 AND BEYOND)</b>	ACT Math Performance <b>23.75 PTS</b>	
Growth All Students <b>95 PTS</b>	Growth All Students <b>95 PTS</b>	U.S. History Proficiency <b>47.5 PTS</b>		Participation <b>28.5 PTS (2016-17)</b> <b>23.75 PTS (2017 &amp; BEYOND)</b>	ACT Reading or English Performance <b>23.75 PTS</b>	
Growth Lowest 25% <b>95 PTS</b>	Growth Lowest 25% <b>95 PTS</b>				or <b>ACT WorkKeys Option</b> <b>47.5 PTS</b>	
						Progress to Proficiency <b>50 PTS</b>
<b>1000 POINTS POSSIBLE</b>						

**NOTE:** Participation is measured in all components.

The Mississippi Accountability System has five performance levels using letter designations (i.e., A, B, C, D, & F). The associated cut scores differentiating each level of performance were established via a standard-setting process in the fall of 2016, and were updated in the fall of 2017 after the second year of MAAP administration.

The grading scale will be increased when 65% of schools and/or districts are earning a grade of “B” or higher, to maintain the rigor of the system and have continuous improvement.

ACCOUNTABILITY SYTSTEM PERFORMANCE LEVEL CUT SCORES			
GRADE	DISTRICTS	ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS	HIGH SCHOOLS
A	668	442	<del>787754</del>
B	599	377	<del>679648</del>
C	536	328	<del>612584</del>
D	489	269	<del>547510</del>
F	<489	<269	< <del>547510</del>

Assignment of district grades is calculated by treating the district as one large school based on the same grading assignments used for schools. Likewise, the state level is calculated as one district inclusive of the full population. Charter schools receive A-F grades in the same manner as traditional public schools.

- b. Describe the weighting of each indicator in the State’s system of annual meaningful differentiation, including how the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in ELP indicators each receive substantial weight individually and, in the aggregate, much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator(s), in the aggregate.

The following tables demonstrate the weighting of all indicators. The Academic Achievement, Other Academic Indicators, Graduation Rate, and Progress in English Language Proficiency each receive substantial weight and much greater weight in the aggregate than the Student Success indicators (~14% - 19% for the Student Success indicators in total).

Mississippi will use all indicators, including the English Language Proficiency indicator, to identify schools for Comprehensive Support and Improvement or Targeted Support and Improvement in the fall of 2018 and as the basis for calculating exit criteria for these schools. Mississippi will delay inclusion of the English Language Proficiency indicator in

official school and district grade calculations until scores are calculated in the fall of 2019.

For schools in which the minimum n-count is not met for the English Language Proficiency indicator to be included in calculations, the 5% of total points typically assigned to the ELP indicator will be distributed proportionally among the remaining indicators. This will keep the overall points available consistent at 700 or 1000 points, depending on the grade-level configuration of the school.

Points earned for each component of the model are based upon the percentage of students meeting criteria for the component. For example, if a 700-point school with an EL population has a mathematics proficiency rate of 60%, the school would earn 57 points ( $.60 \times 95 = 57$ ) for that component.

<b>CURRENT PERCENTAGE WEIGHT OF EACH COMPONENT</b>			
ESSA COMPONENTS	ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	MIDDLE SCHOOL	HIGH SCHOOL
<b>Academic Achievement</b> (ELA Proficiency)	95 ~14% of points	95 ~14% of points	95 ~10% of points
<b>Academic Achievement</b> (Math Proficiency)	95 ~14% of points	95 ~14% of points	95 ~10% of points
<b>Academic Achievement</b> (ELA Growth)	-	-	190 19% of points
<b>Academic Achievement</b> (Math Growth)	-	-	190 19% of points
<b>Other Academic Indicator</b> (ELA Growth)	190 ~27% of points	190 ~27% of points	-
<b>Other Academic Indicator</b> (Math Growth)	190 ~27% of points	190 ~27% of points	-
<b>Graduation Rate</b>	-	-	190 19% of points
<b>English Language Proficiency</b>	35 5% of points	35 5% of points	50 5% of points
<b>Student Success</b> (Science and Social Studies Proficiency and High School Indicators)	95 ~14% of points	95 ~14% of points	190 19% of points
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>1000</b>

BREAKING OUT THE INDICATORS BY COMPONENTS AT THE SCHOOL LEVEL			
SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENT	WEIGHT IN OVERALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL GRADE	WEIGHT IN OVERALL MIDDLE SCHOOL GRADE	WEIGHT IN OVERALL HIGH SCHOOL GRADE
<b>Academic Achievement:</b> Reading Proficiency	95	95	95
<b>Academic Achievement:</b> Math Proficiency	95	95	95
<b>Academic Achievement:</b> Reading Growth	-	-	190
<b>Academic Achievement:</b> Math Growth	-	-	190
<b>Other Academic Indicator:</b> Reading Growth	190	190	-
<b>Other Academic Indicator:</b> Math Growth	190	190	-
<b>Other Academic Indicator:</b> Four-Year Graduation Rate	-	-	190
<b>Student Success:</b> Science Proficiency	95	95	47.5
<b>Student Success:</b> Social Studies Proficiency	-	-	47.5
<b>Student Success:</b> College and Career Readiness	-	-	47.5
<b>Student Success:</b> Acceleration	-	-	47.5
<b>English Language Proficiency:</b> Progress to Proficiency	35	35	50
<b>Participation Rate</b> (see A.4.vii)	<95% = lower grade by one letter	<95% = lower grade by one letter	<95% = lower grade by one letter
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>1000</b>

- c. If the States uses a different methodology for annual meaningful differentiation than the one described in 4.v.a. above for schools for which an accountability determination cannot be made (*e.g.*, P-2 schools), describe the different methodology, indicating the type(s) of schools to which it applies.

For any elementary/middle school that does not have reading/language arts or math scores because the school does not have the required grade level, the scores from the students in the next higher grade in the tested subject within the same district will be applied back to the student's lower elementary school of origin. For the scores to be applied, the student must meet full academic year (FAY) at the lower grade school, the current school and if there is a gap in years, anywhere in the district for the years in between.

#### **EXAMPLE 1 (K-2 SCHOOL)**

##### **Reading/Language Arts and Math Proficiency:**

The reading/language arts and math scores from students in grade 3 who attended the K-2 school and are still in the same district will be used to calculate the math and reading/language arts proficiency for that K-2 school.

**Science Proficiency:** An equating process will be used to adjust for the lack of this component, such that the school is assigned a composite score on the 700-point scale using an equipercentile linking from the remaining 600 possible points.

**Growth:** The reading/language arts and math scores from students in grade 4 who attended the K-2 school and are still in the same district will be used to calculate the growth for Reading-All Students, Math-All Students, Reading-Lowest Performing Students, and Math-Lowest Performing Students for that K-2 school. The students would have to have met FAY in the K-2 school during 2nd grade, the 4th grade school in the same district, and any school within the same district during 3rd grade.

#### **EXAMPLE 2 (K-3 SCHOOL)**

##### **Reading/Language Arts and Math Proficiency:**

The reading/language arts and math scores from students in grade 3 at the school will be used to calculate the math and reading/language arts proficiency for that K-3 school.

**Science Proficiency:** An equating process will be used to adjust for the lack of this component, such that the school is assigned a composite score on the 700-point scale using an equipercentile linking from the remaining 600 possible points.

**Growth:** The reading/language arts and math scores from students in grade 4 who attended the K-3 school and are still in the same district will be used to calculate the growth for Reading/Language Arts-All Students, Math-All Students, Reading/Language Arts-Lowest Performing Students, and Math-Lowest Performing Students for that K-3 school. All applicable FAY rules will apply.

### **EXAMPLE 3 (K-4 SCHOOL)**

#### **Reading/Language Arts and Math Proficiency:**

The reading/language arts and math scores from students in grades 3 and 4 at the school will be used to calculate the math and reading/language arts proficiency for that K-4 school.

**Science Proficiency:** An equating process will be used to adjust for the lack of this component, such that the school is assigned a composite score on the 700-point scale using an equipercentile linking from the remaining 600 possible points.

**Growth:** The reading/language arts and math scores from students in grades 3 and 4 at the school will be used to calculate the growth for Reading/Language Arts-All Students, Math-All Students, Reading-Lowest Performing Students, and Math-Lowest Performing Students for that K-3 school.

All applicable FAY rules will apply.

### **EXAMPLE 4 (6-7 School)**

#### **Reading/Language Arts and Math Proficiency:**

The reading/language arts and math scores from students in grades 6 and 7 at the school will be used to calculate the math and reading/language arts proficiency for that 6-7 school.

**Science Proficiency:** An equating process will be used to adjust for the lack of this component, such that the school is assigned a composite score on the 700-point scale using an equipercentile linking from the remaining 600 possible points.

**Growth:** The reading/language arts and math scores from students in grades 6 and 7 at the school will be used to calculate the growth for Reading/Language Arts-All Students, Math-All Students, Reading/Language Arts-Lowest Performing Students, and Math-Lowest Performing Students for that 6-7 school.

All applicable FAY rules will apply.

### High Schools

Schools with missing data for components specific to high schools will have available proxy data applied in the following order of availability; three (3) year historical school average, two (2) year historical school average, prior year school score, current year district score, prior year district score. If no proxy data is available, an equating process will be used to adjust for the missing components.

#### vi. IDENTIFICATION OF SCHOOLS (*ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)*)

##### a. COMPREHENSIVE SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT SCHOOLS

Describe the State’s methodology for identifying not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement.

The MDE, school districts, and schools are working with a sense of urgency to improve the lowest performing schools and increase access to quality learning opportunities for children in Mississippi’s schools. The MDE, through the work of leaders and teachers within the state and high leverage partnerships with organizations such as the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), Center on School Turnaround, Johns Hopkins University, Chiefs for Change, Academic Development Institute, and the Mississippi State University Research and Curriculum Unit, will diligently seek out and promote the use of those effective instructional practices that have strong evidence of effectiveness. Each partner provides a degree of support and assists with promoting initiatives across the agency. Such partnerships enable the Office of School Improvement to subscribe to the following theory of action:

If the Office of School Improvement ~~supports district and school leaders in building their capacity to support school reform~~ collaborates with district and school leaders to enhance leadership practices that support school transformation, then district and school leaders’ capacity to make results-based decisions will be strengthened ~~that are necessary to drive change~~; and

If their capacity to make results-based decisions is strengthened ~~district and school leaders make courageous decisions that are necessary to drive change~~, then ~~they will be equipped to create and sustain conditions (e.g., teaching and learning, family and community engagement) necessary for schools to fully and effectively impact measurable student outcomes~~ district and school leaders will embed a culture of success and cultivate a sense of belonging within their systems.

This theory of action is further supported by research that promotes a focus on the following key principles and foundational competencies demonstrated by districts and schools to bring about rapid and sustainable improvement.

- Providing strong leadership
- Ensuring effective teaching and improved instruction
- Increasing learning time
- Strengthening school instructional programs
- Using data to inform instruction for continuous improvement
- Improving school safety and discipline
- Providing ongoing mechanism for family and community engagement
- Ensuring school receives ongoing assistance and related support

The Center on School Turnaround's research addressing domains of rapid improvement provides a framework by which Mississippi's improvement efforts can be aligned to four key areas to drive its school improvement work. The domains, turnaround leadership, talent development, instructional transformation, and culture shift provide a needed framework for categorizing prior improvement work as the state transitions to implementation of the requirements of ESSA for identifying and supporting its low performing schools.

The Center on School Turnaround. (2017). Four domains for rapid school improvement: A systems framework [The Center for School Turnaround at WestEd]. San Francisco, CA: WestEd.

See the graphic below for a comprehensive overview of identification and exit criteria, as well as timelines and supports for each category. In addition to the identification of schools for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) and Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), the MDE also identifies districts under state law for two distinct categories. Within the school improvement continuum for student performance outlined in the graphic below, Mississippi law has established an Achievement School District (ASD), to be launched in the 2018-19 school year. While the law allows for school or district identification, the MDE plans to identify entire districts to become a part of the ASD.

Additionally, Mississippi law allows for a District of Transformation model, wherein the state may assign an interim superintendent to districts where the governor has declared a state of emergency for reasons such as serious violations of accreditation standards, lack of financial resources, or issues with the safety or educational interests of children. In



accordance with this law, the district will be eligible to return to local control when the district has met all conditions related to district transformation and has maintained a “C” or higher for five consecutive years if the district was rated a “D” or “F” when placed into district transformation.

Regardless of the identified category, school improvement efforts will include a focus on building local capacity through professional development for teachers and administrators, improved community support through **community engagement councils, formerly referred to as P-16 councils, and** other groups, and strengthened parent engagement through school-based activities.

# CONTINUUM OF SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT CATEGORIES

MOST RIGOROUS INTERVENTIONS

LEAST RIGOROUS INTERVENTIONS

ASD

## ACHIEVEMENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

**DISTRICT IDENTIFICATION METHOD** in accordance with Mississippi Code, Annotated, 37-17-17, may include a school or district labeled as "F" for 2 consecutive years, or 2 out of 3 years

**EXIT** maintain a "C" or higher rating for 5 consecutive years, at which time the State Board of Education may decide to revert the school or district back to local governance within a period of 5 years

**SUPPORTS** includes TSI and CSI supports, if the school within the ASD is so identified, as well as full governance of school by State Department of Education

CSI

## COMPREHENSIVE SUPPORT & IMPROVEMENT

### SCHOOL IDENTIFICATION METHOD

1. graduation rate less than or equal to 67% (identification in 2018-19 based on 2017-18 data; subsequent identification every 3rd year); **OR**
2. bottom 5% of Title IA schools (identification in 2018-19 based on 2017-18 data; subsequent identification every 3rd year; **identification in 2022-2023 and subsequent years will use the most recent 3 years of data**); **OR**
3. previously identified Additional TSI school with 3 consecutive years of subgroup proficiency performance (ELA or math) at or below that of all students in the bottom 5% of Title IA schools (identification for this group to begin in 2021-22)

**EXIT (SCHOOL IDENTIFICATION METHOD #1)** after 3 years, graduation rate above 67%

**EXIT (SCHOOL IDENTIFICATION METHOD #2 and #3)** after 3 years:

- above the bottom 5% of Title IA schools; **AND**
- an increase in the accountability letter grade; **OR**
- an increase in the accountability letter grade that crosses over the midpoint of the letter grade. (For example, bottom half of "F" to top half of "F")

**EXIT (SCHOOL IDENTIFICATION METHOD #3)** after 1 year:

- the 3-yr. average subgroup performance is above that of all students in the lowest performing schools (lowest 5% of Title IA schools based on identification year data); **AND**
- an increase in the accountability letter grade; **OR**
- an increase in the letter grade that crosses over the midpoint of the accountability letter grade (for example, bottom half of "F" to the top half of "F")

### SUPPORTS

- schools will be categorized for differentiated CSI support in the following manner for supports
- CSI Support Level 1: bottom 30% (at-

TSI

## TARGETED SUPPORT & IMPROVEMENT

### SCHOOL IDENTIFICATION METHOD

- Subgroup in lowest 50% of overall accountability index; **AND**
- Subgroup in lowest quartile of 3-year average gap-to-goal; **AND**
- Subgroup scores in lowest quartile of 3-year improvement toward gap-to-goal closure
- Schools with a subgroup meeting all 3 of the above criteria will be rank-ordered **annually**, using overall accountability index, and bottom 5% of all schools not identified for CSI will be identified for TSI

### EXIT

In 2023, schools must meet Part 1 and Part 2a. In 2024 and subsequent years, schools must meet Part 1 and Part 2b.

**PART 1:** School no longer meets criteria above that led to initial identification;

**AND**

**PART 2:**

- a. 1-year (2022-2023) subgroup growth score is 50 or greater in the Fall of 2023
- b. 3-year average subgroup growth score is 50 or greater in Fall 2024 (2023-2024, 2022-2023, 2021-2022) and subsequent years.



### SCHOOL IDENTIFICATION METHOD FOR ADDITIONAL TSI

for all schools, 3-year average subgroup performance is at or below that of all students in the lowest performing schools (bottom 5% of Title IA schools) (identification in 2018-19 based on 2015-16, 2016-17, and 2017-18 data; subsequent **annual 3-year** identification based on most recent 3-year data trend)

### EXIT

- subgroup performance above that of all students in the lowest performing schools (bottom 5% of Title IA schools), based on identification year data; **AND**

~~a minimum)); face-to-face embedded coaching support; access to formula grants; priority access to professional development (literacy, leadership, blended learning concepts, other content areas); quarterly regional leadership team meetings (3-4 people per school); quarterly regional leadership webinars~~

- ~~CSI Support Level 2: virtual coaching support; access to formula grants; priority access to professional development (literacy, leadership, blended learning concepts, other content areas); quarterly regional leadership team meetings (3-4 people per school); quarterly regional leadership webinars~~

(Bottom 30% at a minimum): face-to-face and/or virtual coaching support; access to formula grants; professional learning with priority access to MDE Professional Development Services. *\*The percentage of schools receiving coaching support may be impacted and modified based on availability of personnel.*

- an increase in the accountability letter grade; **OR**
- an increase in the accountability letter grade that crosses over the midpoint of the letter grade. (For example, bottom half of "F" to top half of "F")

**SUPPORTS** evidence-based interventions as outlined in TSI plan approved by the local school board and implemented by the school district; if funding is available once CSI schools are served, TSI schools will have access to ~~formula or competitive grants; training on utilizing data to build capacity and improve instruction~~ grant funding and professional learning

**NOTE:** All "F" schools, regardless of identification for support, will have priority access to ~~the following supports: professional development (literacy, leadership, blended learning concepts, other content areas); quarterly regional leadership team meetings (3-4 people per school); quarterly regional leadership webinars;~~ professional learning supports offered through the MDE Office of Professional Development.



## COMPREHENSIVE SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES

### School Has Primary Responsibility

- Complete comprehensive needs assessment to determine root cause(s) focus areas: Achievement, Fiscal and Human Resources, Instructional Capacity, Early Warning Mechanisms, Multi-Tiered System of Support Implementation effectiveness
- Develop plan to address identified areas and resource inequities; must be board approved and aligned with Title I Schoolwide Plan; document plan and implementation progress ~~in Indistar (MS SOARS)~~; all activities in plan must be based on the required levels of evidence (Strong, Moderate, Promising)
- Create a school leadership team to regularly address progress toward areas causing underperformance
- Reserve 20% of its Title I allocation to support evidence-based interventions for areas causing underperformance (all activities must be based on the required levels of evidence (Strong, Moderate, Promising)
- Present monthly progress update on plan implementation to District Leadership team and local school board (must be a standing item on the ~~District Leadership Team and~~ School Board Agenda)

### District Has Primary Responsibility

- Review and provide feedback on plan prior to submitting for board approval (Instructional and Fiscal Review)
- Track progress of school, quarterly, to ensure fidelity to plan implementation
- Ensure district leadership team engages schools in professional learning through collaborative discussions on current and relevant achievement data, school culture/climate, and instructional decisions
- Conduct end-of-year ~~summative~~ review of school's progress ~~for the school year (may be revised once accountability results provided in the subsequent year)~~
- Establish and regularly engage ~~P16~~ Community Engagement Council ~~(Monthly)– school or district level~~

### MDE Has Primary Responsibility

- Approve, monitor, and review plan
- Funding to support evidence-based interventions for improving student achievement
- Provide technical assistance as requested/needed; ~~(Level 1 provide face to face job-embedded coaching support; Level 2 provide virtual coaching support)~~
- Provide professional ~~development~~ learning that is focused on key areas for improvement/aligned to comprehensive needs assessment areas ~~(Quarterly regional leadership meetings and webinars)– participation required~~



## TARGETED SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES

---

### School Has Primary Responsibility

- Complete comprehensive needs assessment to determine root cause(s) focus areas: Achievement, Fiscal and Human Resources, Instructional Capacity, Early Warning Mechanisms, Multi-Tiered System of Support Implementation effectiveness
- Develop plan to address identified focus areas for subgroup(s), must be board approved and aligned with Title I Schoolwide Plan – document plan and implementation progress; ~~in Indistar (MS SOARS)~~ all activities in plan must be based on the required levels of evidence (Strong, Moderate, Promising)
- Create a school leadership team to regularly address progress toward areas causing underperformance
- Reserve 20% of its Title I allocation to support evidence-based interventions for subgroup(s) causing underperformance (all activities must be based on the required levels of evidence (Strong, Moderate, Promising)
- Present monthly progress update on plan implementation to District Leadership team and local school board (must be a standing item on the ~~District Leadership Team and~~ School Board Agenda)
- Notify parents regarding identification and subgroup(s) performance annually

### District Has Primary Responsibility

- Review and provide feedback on plan prior to submitting for board approval (Instructional and Fiscal Review)
- Track progress of school in meeting subgroup(s) needs, on a quarterly basis, to ensure fidelity to plan implementation
- Ensure district leadership team engages schools in professional learning through collaborative discussions on current and relevant achievement data, school culture/climate, and instructional decisions
- Conduct End of year review ~~summative review~~ of school's progress ~~for the school year (may be revised once accountability results provided in the subsequent year)~~
- Establish and regularly engage parents and community members

### MDE Has Primary Responsibility

- Funding to support evidence-based interventions for improving student achievement (if available)
- Provide access to technical assistance as requested/needed
- Provide access to professional development that is focused on key areas for improvement/aligned to comprehensive needs assessment areas (~~Quarterly regional leadership meetings and webinars~~)

**b. COMPREHENSIVE SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT SCHOOLS**

Describe the State’s methodology for identifying all public high schools in the State failing to graduate one third or more of their students for comprehensive support and improvement.

See above graphic.

**c. COMPREHENSIVE SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT SCHOOLS**

Describe the methodology by which the State identifies public schools in the State receiving Title I, Part A funds that have received additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C) (based on identification as a school in which any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State’s methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)) and that have not satisfied the statewide exit criteria for such schools within a State-determined number of years.

See above graphic.

**ATSI Schools Identified in Fall 2022**

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year to become CSI if no Exit
2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27

Mississippi is revising the state-determined number of years from 3 to 4 years for the 2018 cohort of ATSI schools.

An ATSI school identified in 2018 would become a CSI school in the fall of 2023 instead of the fall of 2022 if it does not exit.

**ATSI Schools Identified in Fall 2018**

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year to become CSI if no Exit
2018-19	2019-20	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24

Mississippi is not revising the state determined number of years for ATSI schools that were identified in 2019-20. An ATSI school identified in 2019 would become a CSI school in the fall of 2023.

**ATSI Schools Identified in Fall 2019**

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year to become CSI if no Exit

2019-20	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
---------	---------	---------	---------

**d. YEAR OF IDENTIFICATION**

Provide, for each type of schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, the year in which the State will first identify such schools and the frequency with which the State will, thereafter, identify such schools. Note that these schools must be identified at least once every three years.

See above graphic.

**e. TARGETED SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT**

Describe the State’s methodology for annually identifying any school with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups of students, based on all indicators in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation, including the definition used by the State to determine consistent underperformance. (*ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C)(iii)*)

See above graphic.

A “consistently underperforming” subgroup is a subgroup of students that (a) scores in the lowest 50% on the overall accountability index results, (b) scores in the lowest quartile of average reading/language arts or mathematics gap-to-goal (current percent proficient less the 70% long-term goal) for the most recent three years of accountability calculations, and (c) scores in the lowest quartile of improvement toward reading/language arts or mathematics gap-to-goal closure over three years. Schools not identified for CSI, and with subgroups meeting criteria (a), (b), and (c), above, will be rank ordered highest to lowest based on the most recent overall accountability index (including all indicators), and the lowest-performing schools will be identified for TSI annually. The number of schools identified will be based on the total number of public schools in Mississippi, resulting in 5% of all public schools being identified for TSI.

**f. ADDITIONAL TARGETED SUPPORT**

Describe the State’s methodology, for identifying schools in which any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State’s methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D), including the year in which the State will first identify such schools and the frequency with which the State will, thereafter, identify such schools. (*ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C)-(D)*)

See above graphic.

For identification purposes, a three-year average accountability index will be calculated for all Title IA schools. Title IA schools will then be rank-ordered to identify the score corresponding to the 5<sup>th</sup> percentile of Title IA schools. This 5<sup>th</sup> percentile score establishes the threshold for identification of Additional TSI schools.

Subgroup three-year average accountability index scores will be calculated for all schools. All schools with a subgroup three-year average accountability index that is at or below the 5<sup>th</sup> percentile threshold will be identified. Identification will occur **annually every 3 years**.

**g. ADDITIONAL STATEWIDE CATEGORIES OF SCHOOLS**

If the State chooses, at its discretion, to include additional statewide categories of schools, describe those categories.

Mississippi is not identifying additional categories of schools to meet federal requirements. The MDE will, however, identify districts under state law. Within the school improvement continuum for student performance, Mississippi law has established an ASD, to be launched in the 2018-19 school year. While the law allows for school or district identification, the MDE plans to identify entire districts to become a part of the ASD.

**vii. ANNUAL MEASUREMENT OF ACHIEVEMENT** (*ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(iii)*)

Describe how the State factors the requirement for 95 percent student participation in statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments into the statewide accountability system.

If a school/district does not meet the 95% minimum participation rate **in required statewide assessments or approved Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Assessment as described in Miss. Admin. Code 7-3: 78.11, State Board Policy Chapter 78, Rule 78.11 Guidelines for Mississippi's Implementation of the Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized, High School Assessment**, the school/district will automatically be dropped a letter grade on the accountability system. Although subgroup participation rates will be reported in addition to all students participation on State and LEA report cards, this penalty in school/district grades will apply to the overall, all students participation rate only. (A 94.5% participation rate will not be rounded to 95%.)

**viii. CONTINUED SUPPORT FOR SCHOOL AND LEA IMPROVEMENT** (*ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)*)

**a. EXIT CRITERIA FOR COMPREHENSIVE SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT SCHOOLS**

Describe the statewide exit criteria, established by the State, for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, including the number of years (not to exceed four) over which schools are expected to meet such criteria.



See above graphic.

By requiring an increase in the accountability letter grade (“F” to “D”, or an increase in the accountability that crosses over the midpoint of the letter grade (for example, bottom half of “F” to top half of “F”), Mississippi is ensuring that a school demonstrates improvement compared to prior performance.

**b. EXIT CRITERIA FOR SCHOOLS RECEIVING ADDITIONAL TARGETED SUPPORT**

Describe the statewide exit criteria, established by the State, for schools receiving additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C), including the number of years over which schools are expected to meet such criteria.

See above graphic.

By requiring an increase in the accountability letter grade (“F” to “D”, or an increase in the accountability that crosses over the midpoint of the letter grade (for example, bottom half of “F” to top half of “F”), Mississippi is ensuring that a school demonstrates improvement compared to prior performance.

**c. MORE RIGOROUS INTERVENTIONS**

Describe the more rigorous interventions required for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the State’s exit criteria within a State-determined number of years consistent with section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(I) of the ESEA.

The MDE will take a more prescriptive approach to activities conducted in the school. All schools identified for CSI that fail to meet the State’s exit criteria within a State-determined number of years will be required to implement evidence-based interventions that meet the “strong” or “moderate” levels of evidence as defined in ESSA, in addition to providing evidentiary support that an intervention meeting this criteria has been implemented.

Mississippi is revising the state-determined number of years a school identified for comprehensive support and improvement in fall 2022 has to meet the statewide exit criteria in order to exit status to 4 years from 3 years before it must take a state-determined more rigorous action. CSI schools identified in the fall of 2023 will begin more rigorous options (MRO) if they do not exit after 3 years of identification (see tables)

**CSI Schools identified in Fall 2022**

				More Rigorous Options
Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	

				begins, if no exit
2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27

**CSI Schools identified in Fall 2023**

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	More Rigorous Options begins, if no exit
2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27

**d. RESOURCE ALLOCATION REVIEW**

Describe how the State will periodically review resource allocation to support school improvement in each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.

~~Through a formal needs assessment interview process, the MDE meets with school teams annually to examine expenditures, student performance data, and other relevant data. Schools receive feedback from the MDE interview team to further develop or refine plans for improvement. All schools are that are identified as CSI and/or TSI, if the appropriation provides for supporting both types of identified schools, will receive a base allocation. After the base allocation is made to each school, any remaining funds will be allocated on a per-pupil basis. Through this method of allocation, LEAs serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for CSI and TSI, will receive greater resource allocation than LEAs that have fewer schools identified for CSI and TSI. The MDE examines the resource allocation process each year, through a review by both the MDE Office of Grants Management and the Office of School Improvement, to ensure that resources are allocated to support the needs of each LEA, in accordance with the MBE-approved methodology. Additionally, the MDE will examine the grant methodology every three years to determine if adjustments are needed to ensure effective allocation of resources.~~

The MDE periodically examines the resource allocation through a formal interview process, the MDE meets with school teams annually, as feasible, to examine expenditures, student performance data, and other relevant data. Schools receive feedback from the MDE interview team to further develop or refine plans for improvement.

**e. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

Describe the technical assistance the State will provide to each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.

See above graphic.

**f. ADDITIONAL OPTIONAL ACTION**

If applicable, describe the action the State will take to initiate additional improvement in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools that are consistently identified by the State for comprehensive support and improvement and are not meeting exit criteria established by the State or in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools implementing targeted support and improvement plans.

In accordance with Mississippi Code, Annotated, § 37-17-17, schools and districts earning an “F” designation for two (2) consecutive years or for two (2) of three (3) consecutive years under the state accountability system may be absorbed into and become a part of the Mississippi Achievement School District (ASD). Upon maintaining a school or district accountability rating of “C” or higher for five (5) consecutive years, the State Board of Education may decide to revert the school or district back to local governance.

## 5. DISPROPORTIONATE RATES OF ACCESS TO EDUCATORS

*(ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B))*

Describe how low-income and minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, and the measures the SEA agency will use to evaluate and publicly report the progress of the State educational agency with respect to such description.<sup>3</sup>

To improve student achievement for all students, we must work toward ensuring that all students have access to effective, diverse teachers and that under-served students are not systemically assigned to ineffective, non-licensed, emergency licensed, and/or inexperienced teachers. With this goal in mind, the MDE will continue to release the *Statewide Student Achievement Gap Report* highlighting differences in achievement across subgroups. The MDE will begin producing an *Access to Highly-Effective Diverse Teachers for ALL Report*.

The *Access to Highly-Effective Diverse Teachers for ALL Report* will examine ways in which students have access to diverse, high-performing, credentialed, and experienced teachers. Moreover, this report will assess whether this access is equitable across the state, districts, and schools, specifically by comparing students served in Title I, minority, low-income schools against Non-Title I, non-minority, non-low-income schools. For the purposes of these calculations, minority schools are calculated as having a student population where at least 50% of the students are a race other than White; low-income schools have a student population where at least 50% of the students are low-income. This will be a companion to the state's Statewide Student Achievement Gap Report. The report will explore the current landscape of Mississippi students and their access to highly effective, diverse teachers. This will be accomplished by examining both the supply and distribution of highly-effective diverse teachers at the state, district, and school levels. This report will support districts and schools in examining their teaching data and their teacher-student matching practices to ensure equitable access to highly-effective diverse teachers for Mississippi students. In addition, these data will be used to identify Title I schools with a statistically significant difference in access. Once schools have been identified, those Title I schools will be required to detail in their consolidated application how they plan to ensure students in Title I schools are not systematically assigned to underperforming teachers.

Starting in the 2018-19 school year, districts will be required to report individual teacher effectiveness data based on a teacher observation. **The MDE will continue to consider opportunities to introduce a multiple measure professional growth system to include teacher observations, student outcomes, and/or climate surveys as it modernizes statewide student and educator information systems. Commencing in the**

---

<sup>3</sup> Consistent with ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B), this description should not be construed as requiring a State to develop or implement a teacher, principal or other school leader evaluation system.

~~2020-21 school year, the MDE will launch a multiple measure professional growth system to include a teacher observation, student outcomes, and a climate survey.~~ A highly effective teacher is described as one who has earned a 3 or better on the Mississippi Professional Growth System (PGS). Preliminary effectiveness data can be found in the tables below. For the 2018-19 academic year, 79.9% of all schools reported teacher effectiveness data under the PGS. Of these, 79.3% of Low-Income schools and 90.6% of Not Low-Income schools reported teacher effectiveness measures for 2018-19. Additionally, 76.8% of Minority schools reported teacher effectiveness data compared to 85.0% of Non-Minority schools in 2018-19.

2018-19 TITLE I LOW INCOME ANALYSIS			
	NON-TITLE I AND NOT LOW- INCOME	TITLE I AND LOW-INCOME	GAP
Average Teacher Effectiveness Score	3.54	3.14	0.40
Percentage of Emergency Teachers	2.8%	9.7%	6.9%
Percentage of Teachers Out of Field	2.5%	5.0%	2.5%
Percentage of Teachers Not Certified	0.7%	2.2%	1.5%
Percentage of Inexperienced Teachers	16.9%	24.4%	7.5%
Percentage of Teachers with Effectiveness Score Below 3	5.5%	17.0%	11.5%

2018-19 TITLE I MINORITY ANALYSIS			
	NON-TITLE I AND NOT A MINORITY	TITLE I AND MINORITY	GAP
Average Teacher Effectiveness Score	3.43	3.04	0.39
Percentage of Emergency Teachers	3.7%	13.5%	9.8%
Percentage of Teachers Out of Field	2.7%	6.5%	3.7%
Percentage of Teachers Not Certified	1.1%	3.2%	2.1%

<b>Percentage of Inexperienced Teachers</b>	17.6%	27.5%	9.9%
<b>Percentage of Teachers with Effectiveness Score Below 3</b>	9.1%	21.2%	12.1%

Data reveal that a higher percentage of minority students were served by teachers with no license or certification than non-minority students. Additionally, a higher percentage of low-income students were served by teachers with no license or certification and by inexperienced teachers than non-minority students.

The MDE has identified a comprehensive set of strategies aimed at ensuring that low-income and minority children are not disproportionately taught by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers. The chart below provides equity definitions that the MDE will use to measure the effectiveness of the strategies and monitor the elimination of equity gaps.

<b>EQUITY DEFINITIONS</b>	
<b>KEY TERM</b>	<b>STATEWIDE DEFINITION (OR STATEWIDE GUIDELINES)</b>
<b>Ineffective teacher</b>	An ineffective teacher is one that has earned a performance level rating of 1 or 2 on the Mississippi Educator and Administrator Professional Growth System (PGS).
<b>Inappropriately licensed teacher</b>	A teacher who holds an emergency license or an expert citizen license, is teaching out-of-field, or holds no license.
<b>Inexperienced teacher</b>	A teacher with 0-3 years of teacher experience.
<b>Low-income student</b>	“Low-income” is defined using the percentage of students who are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.
<b>Minority student</b>	"Minority" is defined for purposes of this plan as all students who are American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, or two or more races.

The *Mississippi Critical Teacher Shortage Act of 1998* was established with the purpose of attracting qualified teachers to critical shortage school districts in the state. As a group, these districts have large minority and low-income student populations and higher teacher attrition rates than the rest of the state. As a result, many of these districts are also rated “D” or “F” in the state’s accountability system. The MBE designates these districts annually in accordance with MBE policy using a formula that was created to identify districts with the greatest teacher recruitment


and retention challenges. The current formula is being refined to more accurately identify districts. Approximately 82% of the student population in these school districts are from minority groups.

The strategies that MDE has identified focuses on reducing, and ultimately eliminating, the disproportionalities in the critical shortage districts which are most impacted by teacher recruitment/retention challenges. In order to ensure equitable access of effective and experienced teachers for these students, the MDE must implement a set of strategies designed to attract, prepare, and support/retain teachers in these districts.


To more effectively attract teachers to schools with large low-income and minority student populations, the MDE will support districts in the implementation of Grow-Your-Own strategies.



Improving the rigor of educator preparation programs (EPPs) and the educator licensure process, the MDE will address the preparation of all teachers in the state.



Finally, to retain teachers in schools with the largest low-income and minority student populations, the MDE has established strategies that work to support teachers.



Together, these strategies will improve the instruction in all schools, particularly those critical shortage school districts with the most vulnerable student populations. These strategies are discussed in detail in **Section D Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction**.

These equitable access strategies were, in large part, identified by stakeholders. In implementing strategies that address the teacher workforce, engagement with stakeholders, particularly those most impacted by critical teacher shortages, is essential. The MDE will include vertical teams from the critical shortage school districts in the work of measuring and refining these strategies. Administrators and teachers in these districts are experts on the issues and challenges impacting the recruitment and retention of teachers in their districts. Engagement and collaboration with these school districts are required to effectively address and monitor progress towards the elimination of recruitment/retention barriers. This collaboration is an essential component in the success of the MDE's strategies. As a result of the engagement of stakeholder groups, the MDE has a better understanding of the likely causes of the equity gaps and strategies, including unintended consequences or likely implementation challenges for certain strategies.

To ensure that the equitable access work is data-driven, the MDE will annually measure the impact of the strategies in eliminating equity gaps. These data analyses will be publicly reported on the MDE's Public Reporting webpage at [mdereports.mdek12.org](https://mdereports.mdek12.org).



## 6. SCHOOL CONDITIONS *(ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(C))*

Describe how the SEA agency will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A to improve school conditions for student learning, including through reducing: (i) incidences of bullying and harassment; (ii) the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom; and (iii) the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety.

The State of Mississippi enacted a law in 2010 that prohibits bullying or harassing behavior in Mississippi public schools. The law requires all local school districts to adopt a policy prohibiting bullying and harassing behavior. The Bully Free Program was highlighted in statewide training provided by the MDE Office of Healthy Schools, in partnership with the Mississippi Attorney General's Office. LEAs have access to training modules, community action toolkits, and professional development for educators and school bus drivers – all related to bullying prevention.

Each LEA, within its Consolidated Plan, must describe the safeguards that are in place to ensure that excessive discipline does not negatively impact academic achievement. The SEA provides routine professional growth opportunities for LEAs in best practices for behavioral interventions and effective positive behavioral supports. The SEA provides extensive training that, implemented with fidelity, will allow students' needs to be met in a timely manner through the use of the Early Warning Systems and the Multi-Tiered System of Support. This allows the MDE to support LEAs in the promotion of positive school cultures, the implementation of Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports, conflict resolution, situational de-escalation, conflict management, and the Mississippi Student Safety Act.

Students' health and safety is a priority. Thus, each LEA is required to have restraint and seclusion policies and procedures in place to ensure that students are not subject to aversive behavioral interventions or compromises to student health and safety. Physical restraint will only be used as outlined in an LEA's restraint and seclusion policies and procedures. The MDE monitors the implementation of the restraint and seclusion policies and any complaints that are made.

## 7. SCHOOL TRANSITIONS *(ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(D))*

Describe how the State will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A in meeting the needs of students at all levels of schooling (particularly students in the middle grades and high school), including how the State will work with such LEAs to provide effective transitions of students to middle grades and high school to decrease the risk of students dropping out.

The MDE supports LEAs in meeting the needs of all students in providing effective transition opportunities for students, from early childhood to post-secondary education/workforce. LEAs are encouraged to use funding available to them to provide seamless transition from one level to the next. Within the Consolidated Plan, LEAs are required to detail the strategies implemented to transition students from

home to elementary school, elementary school to middle grades, middle grades to high school, and high school to postsecondary education or to a career. Some of the supports that the SEA has in place are outlined below.

### **EARLY CHILDHOOD COLLABORATIVES**

Transitioning from Pre-K to kindergarten is a big step for many children. Schools can support this transition by sharing useful information with kindergarten teachers and by engaging in a variety of transition activities. The MDE provides supports to the LEAs with Kindergarten Transition Plans, webinars, and a checklist. In Mississippi there are currently **38** state-funded early learning collaboratives comprised of school districts, Head Start agencies, child care centers, and private non-profit organizations. **Additional grant opportunities will be offered through the state-invested pre-K (SIP) program and expansion of the ELC each year.**

Professional development provides early childhood professionals the opportunity to learn about and implement best practices in early childhood through training and individualized technical assistance. Each school year, the Office of Early Childhood offers a variety of trainings specific to individuals who work in Pre-K and Kindergarten. Additionally, schools and Early Learning Collaboratives may request technical assistance at any time.

### **SCHOOL COUNSELOR**

In order to help alleviate anxiety and answer questions, school counselors collaborate with all stakeholders to ensure a smooth transition at each level. School counselors are encouraged to collaborate with other school counselors at upper and lower grade levels to design activities that support students in the transition from one school to the next. School counselors design programs which are inclusive and consider the needs of all students.

School counselors work with students to explore and plan for "next steps", whether that is entering a new elementary school, middle school, high school, or a postsecondary institution. High school counselors work with local, state, and national community colleges and universities to identify educational opportunities and supports for students. High school counselors provide information to parents and students regarding college admissions and completing scholarship and financial aid applications. Additionally, school counselors collaborate with their administration and local community and business leaders to determine opportunities in the local workforce. School counselors support the transition needs of all students, including students with disabilities. School counselors work with IEP teams to assist with planning transitions for students with disabilities.

### **MULTI-TIERED SYSTEM OF SUPPORT**

The Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) is structured to accelerate and maximize student academic and social-emotional outcomes through the application of collaborative data-based problem solving utilized by effective leadership at all levels

of the educational system. MDE oversees and coordinates the implementation of policies and procedures related to MTSS and provides extensive professional development for effective MTSS implementation for school-based teams, administrators, staff, parents and agencies. In addition, MDE offers guidance on appropriate intervention data collection, data-based decision making, evaluation, and progress monitoring for students in need of supplementary intensive academic and behavioral supports to ensure all students graduate high school college- and career-ready.

### **INDIVIDUAL STUDENT SUCCESS PLANS**

Transition from the middle school to high school is facilitated by the development of the Individual Student Success Plan (ISSP). The ISSP encompasses activities designed for students to explore their interests and abilities and to connect those interests and abilities to career pathways. School counselors work with students and parents to identify opportunities for advanced academic coursework, career and technical opportunities, and/or remedial needs.

### **TRANSITION PLANS**

Mississippi also has developed a transition plan for students with disabilities. A transition plan is the section of the IEP that outlines transition goals and services for the student. The transition plan is based on the individual needs and strengths of the student. The purpose of the plan is to identify and develop goals which need to be accomplished during the current school year in order to meet postsecondary goals. IDEA requires that a transition plan must be in place when the student turns 16. Mississippi State Board Policy 74.19 requires students in Mississippi to have a transition plan in place by age 14.



## TITLE I, PART C

### Education of Migratory Children

*NOTE: Section B relates to MBE Strategic Plan Goals 1 and 2.*

#### 1. SUPPORTING NEEDS OF MIGRATORY CHILDREN (ESEA section 1304(b)(1))

Describe how, in planning, implementing, and evaluating programs and projects assisted under Title I, Part C, the State and its local operating agencies will ensure that the unique educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, are identified and addressed through:

- i. The full range of services that are available for migratory children from appropriate local, State, and Federal educational programs;
- ii. Joint planning among local, State, and Federal educational programs serving migratory children, including language instruction educational programs under Title III, Part A;
- iii. The integration of services available under Title I, Part C with services provided by those other programs; and
- iv. Measurable program objectives and outcomes.

The Mississippi Migrant Education Program (MS MEP) provides a variety of services to Mississippi's migrant students. These services include:

- Partnering with Mississippi school districts to implement after-school and summer programs ~~which utilize project-based learning~~ in areas that lack district-funded academic programs
- Providing pre-K support services through raising awareness of the importance of early education, assisting parents with Head Start/preschool enrollment, and administering a kindergarten readiness checklist
- Offering parent education programs, including local and statewide meetings as well as home visits, to empower parents in providing educational support in the home
- Providing career education and academic planning for elementary and secondary students
- Supporting the medical and dental needs of students, including assistance with Medicaid enrollment, informing families of free/low cost health care services, arranging appointments, and providing translation services and transportation
- Providing school supplies and ~~technology resources~~ needed for migrant students to be successful in the classroom
- Offering support on EL strategies and other instructional supports for teachers of migrant students
- Tutoring Out-of-School Youth interested in securing a high school equivalency and/or building competence in English language skills.

The MS MEP also provides referral services to migrant students by referring them to local, State, and Federal programs that include, but are not limited to:

- ~~The Boys & Girls Clubs~~
  - 21st Century Learning programs
  - Head Start Centers
  - District-funded academic programs and tutoring programs
  - Lion's Club
  - The Junior Auxiliary
- ~~Excel by 5~~
  - Mississippi Family Resource Centers
  - Summer Reading Programs at various Mississippi libraries.

All children are determined to be migrant and eligible for services via the MEP before information is input into MIS2000, the system used to house migrant data at the Mississippi Migrant Education Service Center (MMESC). The information ~~that is~~ entered into MIS2000 comes from Certificates of Eligibility (COE) that are completed ~~on~~ for each migrant family.

The SEA's COE is standard and contains the following documentation:

- father/mother's legal name,
- current male/female guardian's name,
- current address,
- all children's names,
- grades,
- birthdates,
- gender,
- birthplace,
- date of school enrollment,
- student number,
- school district of origin,
- current school district,
- qualifying arrival date,
- residency date,
- type of move and with whom,
- type of employment (seasonal/temporary),
- qualifying activity/employment and person verifying information, i.e., parent, guardian, etc.

The COE's information is verified by trained recruiters. All COEs contain the signature of the interviewee, the interviewer/recruiter, the program coordinator (who verifies the content and eligibility of the family) **and are**

reviewed by ID&R Coordinator and Data Coordinator at MMESC. If there is a question regarding eligibility, the COE is forwarded to the state for a final determination. All migrant recruiters are trained and certified by the SEA, ESCORT, and national Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) experts. Recruiters attend formal trainings, workshops and conferences at least three times per year. They are required to maintain copies of ID&R guidelines/eligibility standards and the non-regulatory guidance along with other ~~relative~~ related educational/reference material. Recruiters are required to visit schools, attend parent meetings and community activities in order to identify and recruit migrant families. They also conduct home visits on a regular basis.

The SEA meets with MMESC staff and regional recruiters/personnel monthly at recruiters' meetings, coordinators meetings, technical assistance visits and monitoring/audit visits. The MMESC previously evaluated the entire 82 counties of Mississippi to determine where the migrant families are likely to reside. In doing this, the MMESC identified specific area concentrations in which migrant students are present.

The MS MEP will continue to follow a structured process of recruiting to ensure that all possible children are identified in all counties. This process includes:

- a. Canvassing the counties in which the State has not previously had migrant students to determine if migrants ~~children~~ have recently entered these areas. The MS MEP will complete this task by visiting the areas, establishing new contacts, and conducting necessary research to establish a better mapping of the service area.
- b. Implementing the Year-Long Recruiter Action Plan based upon the known areas of migrant concentration as well as the target areas for further exploration and identification of migrant students. This will ensure that recruiting, servicing, and networking are accomplished in each area that the MS MEP is mandated to serve.
- c. Providing staff development to ~~all~~ school districts by notifying them about the MMESC and its purpose. This presentation ensures that ~~all~~ school personnel have accurate information concerning the MEP and the MMESC.
- d. Planning and conducting sweeps during the harvest seasons of specific areas, with the recruiter of the region leading the recruitment plan. The ID&R Coordinator coordinates and facilitates the sweeps. The sweeps ensure that all areas in the specific region are covered with a team of recruiters recruiting in pairs for several days.
- e. Building good relationships with farmers. The recruiters have built positive relationships with many farmers in their areas, resulting in the recruitment of many more migrant families. Recruiters visit every farm

and farmer to be found in each area to introduce the program and to build a collaborative relationship.

The MMESC has implemented several programmatic activities to ensure that the unique educational needs of migrant children, including pre-K migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, are met and they can achieve the State's measurable outcomes and performance targets.

- a. The MMESC has participated in all Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) committee meetings, and in the development of the CNA and Service Delivery Plan (SDP) for the state of Mississippi.
- b. The MMESC intends to continue moving toward implementation of the service delivery plan in order to better address and meet students' needs.
- c. The MMESC will continue to develop programs and increase collaboration with other agencies to better service the needs of these students.
- d. The MMESC continues to participate as a member of the ~~CNA CAN~~ committee as follows:
  - Attends all CNA ~~meetings trainings~~ at the State level and local level along with expert migrant consultants,
  - Continues to participate in the development and planning of the CNA plan and service delivery for the State; and
  - Implements the CNA plan that the State develops to identify the unique education needs of the migrant students and to better serve them.

To identify the needs of each child in the migrant program, the local recruiter makes a visit to the potential migrant family in which he/she collects information on the home needs. Additionally, the recruiter/service provider collects information from migrant students' teachers, and the information is uploaded to the MIS2000 database. The project coordinator creates an educational service plan for individual students. Educational services are delivered according to the needs of students.

~~The MDE contracts with the MS MEP at Mississippi State University to operate the program. The MDE provides oversight of the program, including monthly collaborative meetings where the progress of the program and any key decisions are discussed.~~

The MDE Office of Federal Programs completes, **in collaboration with MMESC and other experts and stakeholders**, a four-stage program evaluation process in the continuous improvement cycle to ensure that all

migratory students' needs in Mississippi are met. This process includes an evaluation of the full range of services available for migratory children in Mississippi; joint planning among local, state and federal educational programs, including language instruction education programs under Title III, Part A; the integration of services available under Title I Part C with services provided by other programs; and measurable program objectives and outcomes. This four-stage process includes

- a. a comprehensive needs assessment that captures the current needs of the state's migratory students;
- b. a service delivery plan based on the needs identified in the comprehensive needs assessment;
- c. implementation of the program services needed to assist the students; and
- d. a program evaluation to determine if the objectives of the services were met. The final stage informs the first stage in this continuous cycle.

The MDE provides technical assistance and monitors the MS MEP to ensure that the full range of services is available to and provided for migratory children. The MDE assesses the educational needs of ~~the~~ migratory children during the Comprehensive Needs Assessment. Identified needs are then addressed in the Service Delivery Plan. The MDE offers technical assistance and monitors the MS MEP in meeting the Measurable Program Outcomes. ~~Measurable Program Outcomes data is submitted annually to the MDE Office of Special Populations.~~ The MDE provides technical assistance and monitors the MS MEP to ensure that the strategies and Measurable Program Outcomes in the Service Delivery Plan are being achieved. The MS MEP works collaboratively with the Migrant Education Program Sites statewide to reach these outcomes. The MS MEP partners with all ~~of~~ the State's LEAs to identify and serve ~~migratory~~EL students. A portion of state MEP funds is used to provide oversight and support to the MEP program and to teachers and other educators who serve migrant students. The program provides professional training at conferences and LEA meetings across Mississippi and aims to train ~~EL-designated~~ teachers on classroom strategies for integrating and supporting migratory students in the classroom. The MS MEP ~~coordinates partners~~ with the local, State, and Federal educational programs ~~to support which target~~ increased English proficiency for all ~~migratory English Learners (ELs)~~, as well as ~~foster~~ improvements in reading and math proficiency across grade levels. ~~Moreover, the MS MEP provides educational and technological resources for classroom use by local EL teachers to accommodate the critical needs of migratory children with limited English proficiency.~~

The MS MEP has integrated services with various partners, which include local, State, and Federal programs. The following are examples of the MS



MEP's current partnerships:

### **SCHOOL DISTRICT PERSONNEL, INCLUDING FEDERAL PROGRAM COORDINATORS**

In an effort to educate LEAs about the migrant population, the MMESC collaborates with Federal program coordinators to provide professional development for teachers. The training consists of general information about the MEP and more specific information about cultural differences, language and academic challenges, such as understanding the migratory lifestyle, best practices for English Learners, cultivating a welcoming school experience for migratory students and parents, culturally responsive teacher strategies, and evidence-based resources to help in serving families and students. ~~and language and academic challenges, such as the dynamics of the Mexican School System, rural academic challenges and opportunities, dealing with a non-English speaker in the classroom, and some common Spanish phrases to help in serving families and students.~~

### **EL TEACHERS**

~~In many rural areas, no bilingual individuals are available, and persons trained in EL are not easily found. The MS MEP has provided EL teachers with instructions and supplemental teaching materials to promote enhanced English language instruction.~~

The MS MEP supports and utilizes, (through hiring as intermittent employees), teachers to provide after-school ~~and summer~~ tutoring ~~and teachers for summer~~ programs. The MS MEP has previously provided professional development during in-service days at schools and will continue to provide training as appropriate.

Additionally, the MS MEP provided ~~summer programs in three locations during the 2015-2016 school year. Each school has bilingual teachers; however, not all are trained to teach ELs~~ a range of summer projects statewide through quality service providers trained in meeting the unique educational needs of migratory students.

### **COUNSELORS, PRINCIPALS, AND OTHER STAFF**

The program has developed and will continue to develop positive relationships with schools, and works closely with school personnel to identify target areas of migrant students' needs. The program also provides ~~cultural competency and academic~~ professional development to ~~school personnel to cultivate an effective home-school connection~~

between migratory students and school staff. ~~counselors~~. Material on the MEP has been shared at the National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education (NASDME) Conference, the Mississippi Association of State Superintendents (MASS) Summer and Winter Conferences, the McKinney-Vento Homeless Conference, ~~and the Dropout Prevention Conference, and the Equity Conference~~. Additionally, multiple trainings have been held at the MDE Federal Programs regional meetings held at locations across the State.

## FAMILIES

MS MEP personnel often act as intermediaries between schools and migrant parents for a variety of reasons and academic purposes. The program's staff ~~sometimes~~ provide important support to families in connecting them to appropriate language and translation resources and by serving as a liaison between the families and school system. ~~translation of report cards and other documents to high-need school districts due to the shortage of Spanish-speaking bilingual educators across the state. When parent meetings are held, principals and other school leadership often is invited to speak to parents, and translation is provided.~~

## RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS

Collaboration has occurred with various churches to assist in language training and support of English as a Second Language classes, and efforts have been made to connect migrant families with needed supplies provided by churches, including clothing and food. Through a partnership between the program and Catholic Charities, GED classes have been held. Churches also have supported the program in identifying migrant families, particularly in rural areas.

The SEA's independent Office of Program Evaluation conducts a ~~MSMEP contracted with an outside program evaluator, ESCORT, to conduct~~ a CNA in order to determine the critical needs of migrant youth in Mississippi. Measurable Program Outcomes (MPOs) for the MS MEP are based on the CNA ~~performed by ESCORT~~. The current MPOs are outlined in the SDP. The goals are written for the 2017-18 school year and will be reassessed. ~~at the end of this year~~. The following list details the eleven objectives and goals:

## SCHOOL READINESS

1. Increase percentage of migrant children (ages 3-5) who participate in Pre-K programming.
2. Increase the percentage of migrant children who demonstrate mastery on a school readiness checklist.

## READING PROFICIENCY

3. By the end of 2017-18, 60% of (K-5) and 15% of (6-12) migrant students will receive supplementary summer instruction in reading.
4. Increase percentage of migrant students (identified as “below proficient” in reading) who participate in supplemental instructional reading programs during the regular term.

#### **MATH PROFICIENCY**

5. By the end of 2017-18, 60% of (K-5) and 15% of (6-12) migrant students will receive supplementary summer instruction in mathematics.
6. Increase percentage of migrant students (identified as “below proficient” in math) who participate in supplemental instructional math programs during the regular school term.

#### **HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION**

7. Increase percentage of migrant students (grades 8-12) who receive assistance with credit accrual, career planning, and goal-setting.
8. Increase the percentage of migrant high school students who have earned the required number of credits to graduate within 4-5 years.

#### **HEALTH**

9. Increase the percentage of migrant parents who report that they know where to obtain primary care services.

#### **OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH**

10. Increase the percentage of interested OSY receiving mini lessons which aim to increase the English proficiency of OSY students and their integration into the various MS communities in which they reside.
11. Increase the percentage of OSY who report that they know where to obtain primary care services.

## **2. PROMOTE COORDINATION OF SERVICES** *(ESEA section 1304(b)(3))*

Describe how the State will use Title I, Part C funds received under this part to promote interstate and intrastate coordination of services for migratory children, including how the State will provide for educational continuity through the timely transfer of pertinent school records, including information on health, when children move from one school to another, whether or not such move occurs during the regular school year.

The MDE releases a portion of Title 1, Part C funds to the MMESC through a three-year grant. The MMESC does not have to use the funds provided to coordinate and communicate with MEPs across the United States due to existing access to databases which contain migrant student data. The MMESC staff has been granted read-only access to MSIS, enabling them to monitor students’ moves and academic data, in turn, to be entered into the MIS2000 database. With MSIS access, the MMESC can also ascertain which students are **English Learners (ELs)**, and obtain migrant student

test scores and other vital student information that will provide educational continuity in a timely manner. The MMESC also utilizes the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX), which allows MEPs across the state to communicate and coordinate with one another regarding migrant student information. The information that is most sought after in MSIX is the student's enrollment dates in other programs as well as their move dates. By using MSIS and MSIX, the MMESC can successfully gather base information for incoming students to verify the accuracy of their eligibility and their current academic standing. The MMESC uses funds to promote interstate collaboration when appropriate with surrounding states. This occurs when a ~~nearby~~ ~~close~~ town in a neighboring state contains programs for migrant students and they allow Mississippi migrant students to enroll in their programs. In this instance, the MMESC will pay for all transportation and enrollment fees to the program. Intrastate collaboration is important to the MMESC, as the MS MEP must only supplement services to migrant students rather than supplant services. The MMESC funds intrastate collaboration by providing enrollment fees for migrant students who are eligible to enroll in any local, State, or Federal programs. Programs include but are not limited to school district-based academic programs, ~~the Boys and Girls Club~~, and 21st Century Learning Centers. Additionally, the MMESC promotes interstate and intrastate collaboration with health agencies willing to assist with training and speaking to migrant parents on health issues.

### 3. USE OF FUNDS (*ESEA section 1304(b)(4)*)

Describe the State's priorities for the use of Title I, Part C funds, and how such priorities relate to the State's assessment of needs for services in the State.

To optimize the quality of educational services and efficiently use Title I, Part C funds, a Migrant Student Service Plan has been proposed under the guidance of the Director of the MMESC. By utilizing this plan, the MMESC staff will be able to better target migrant students who should receive quality educational services to meet the overarching goals of the MMESC. This plan shall be used in making decisions regarding the rate at which students receive educational services. This plan shall also influence the hiring of intermittent tutors for migrant children. This plan aligns with the previous CNA and SDP ~~developed by ESCORT through the MDE~~. Overall, this plan should improve the quality and quantity of educational services received by migrant students throughout the regular school year and summer term.

The Migrant Student Service Plan intends to meet the following goals as indicated in the 2019 Service Delivery Plan:

- Increase school readiness services to pre-K students
- Increase reading supplementary services (K-12th grade)
- Increase mathematic supplementary services (K-12th grade)
- Ensure high school students receive credit accrual services for graduation
- **Ensure out of school youth receive appropriate support services**

This plan prioritizes the delivery of services to Priority for Service (PFS) students enrolled in the MEP. PFS students represent the students enrolled in the MEP that require timely supplementary services that aim to increase their academic success. The MMESC has witnessed a decline in PFS students. This decline has occurred due to families within the MEP settling in an area rather than moving frequently. Another cause of this decline is the failure to meet PFS requirements. Due to the nature of this decline, the MMESC developed a “High Needs” indicator for migrant students in need of timely and intensive services. These students do not meet the first requirement listed under the PFS definition; however, they fall under the second category for the PFS definition. By implementing the “High Needs” indicator, students under this category will be targeted to be a priority group to receive supplementary and educational services. This plan also intends to prioritize providing services to students who have an upcoming end-of-eligibility date. Upcoming is defined as occurring in three or fewer months of the date of eligibility termination. Pre-K students with an age of four years old and higher will be a priority to receive services to increase school readiness. These services aim to train parents on how to teach and prepare their students for Kindergarten. High school students will be targeted for credit accrual.

By implementing the above priorities, the MMESC plans to service migrant students in the following order:

1. Priority for Services Students
2. High Needs Students
3. End of Eligibility
4. Pre-K
5. High School
6. General Migrant Population



## TITLE I, PART D

### Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk

*NOTE: Section C relates to MBE Strategic Plan Goals 1, 2, and 4.*

#### 1. TRANSITIONS BETWEEN CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES AND LOCAL PROGRAMS

*(ESEA section 1414(a)(1)(B))*

Provide a plan for assisting in the transition of children and youth between correctional facilities and locally operated programs.

The MDE requires youth facilities to provide a plan that demonstrates a process that will assist with the transition of the child and/or youth between correctional facilities and locally operated programs.

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE)

- Works collaboratively with Mississippi state agencies (including mental health, health, and corrections) and LEAs to provide technical support to ~~t-for-the~~ staff at the state correctional facilities.
- Provides training on the use of funds and ~~blending and~~ braiding of funds to support children and youth.
- Encourages collaboration between correctional facilities and locally operated programs to support the education of children and youth.

In accordance with state law, the transition team will consist of a certified teacher provided by the local sponsoring school district, or a private provider agreed upon by the youth court judge and sponsoring school district, the appropriate official from the local home school district, the school attendance officer assigned to the local home school district, and the youth court counselor or representative. The parent or guardian shall participate on the team unless excused by the youth court judge. Plans shall include providing the youth and his/~~or~~her parents or guardian with copies of the youth's detention center education and health records, information regarding the youth's home community, referrals to mental and counseling services when appropriate, and providing assistance in making initial appointments with community service providers.

#### 2. PROGRAM OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES *(ESEA section 1414(a)(2)(A))*

Describe the program objectives and outcomes established by the State that will be used to assess the effectiveness of the Title I, Part D program in improving the academic, career, and technical skills of children in the program.

#### OBJECTIVE

Provide technical support for the staff at the state's correctional facilities, focusing on strategies that serve students in the program.

### OUTCOMES

- Students who are enrolled in the program long-term (90 days or more) will show at least a 5% increase in reading proficiency between pre-tests and post-tests.
- Students who are enrolled in the program long-term (90 days or more) will show at least a 5% increase in math proficiency between pre-tests and post-tests.
- Students who are enrolled in the program long-term (90 days or more) will show at least a 5% increase in successful completion of a Career Readiness certificate and a minimum level of Bronze on the ACT WorkKeys. All students served by the program will leave the program with up-to-date reading and math achievement records.
- ~~Neglected and~~ Delinquent facilities served by Title I, Part D funds will see a 5% increase in the percentage of students receiving a high school diploma or receiving a high school ~~equivalency~~ equivalent.



## TITLE II, PART A

### Supporting Effective Instruction

**NOTE:** Section D relates to MBE Strategic Plan Goals 1, 2, 4, and 5.

#### 1. USE OF FUNDS (ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(A) and (D))

Describe how the State educational agency will use Title II, Part A funds received under Title II, Part A for State-level activities described in section 2101(c), including how the activities are expected to improve student achievement.

Goal 4 of the MBE 5-Year Strategic Plan ~~2018-2022 2016-2020~~ states that “every school has effective teachers and leaders.” This goal involves ensuring that teachers and leaders are provided with opportunities for continuous professional growth at every stage of their career continuum. This continuum includes the attraction and recruitment of teachers/leaders, the strengthening of teacher and leader preparation programs, improving the state’s licensure/certification process, ensuring that all districts provide an evidenced-based induction and mentoring program for novice teachers and leaders, and refining the continuous cycle of professional growth. The MDE will use Title II, Part A funds received for State-level activities as described in section 2102(c) by providing support to local school districts for Grow-Your-Own programs, creating induction and mentoring programs, and encouraging professional growth through technical assistance and training.

#### **ATTRACTING AND RECRUITING**

The MDE will provide guidance and technical assistance to districts to support the development and implementation of Grow-Your-Own programs. These programs create a teacher workforce pipeline for students, paraprofessionals, and other community members. Grow-Your-Own programs also help to create a sustainable pipeline of educators who are members of the community in which they teach. This Grow-Your-Own initiative is also discussed in Section 2 –Equitable Access to Teachers.

The MDE will collaborate with the Educators Rising and ~~Teacher Academy~~ **Educator Preparation** programs to provide guidance and assistance to students interested in teaching. This effort is a Grow-Your-Own strategy. Educators Rising identifies its mission is to “cultivate highly skilled educators by guiding young people on a path to becoming accomplished teachers, beginning in high school and extending through college and into the profession.”

#### **EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS**



Increasing the rigor of the educator preparation program is a priority of the MDE. See additional detail in section 6.

### INDUCTION AND MENTORING

A review of the literature on teacher attrition reveals a lack of support as a major cause for teachers leaving the profession. In Mississippi, nearly 50% of teachers leave the profession within the first five years. In addition, many educator preparation programs are not providing teachers candidates with the skills to be effective in the classroom. Induction and mentoring programs help to provide teachers with strategies to improve their effectiveness. Currently, there is no policy or law requiring induction and mentoring programs for novice teachers. Induction and mentoring programs have been shown to increase new teacher retention by nearly 6% and 7%, respectively.

Using Title II funds, the MDE will provide technical assistance and training to districts on implementing structured induction and mentoring programs. Currently, the MDE provides mentor training materials, but offers no regional training to district leaders on the implementation of the training. A partnership with the Collaboration for Effective Educator Development Accountability and Reform Center (The CEEDAR Center) includes work around the implementation of an induction and mentoring programs in all districts.



## PROFESSIONAL GROWTH SYSTEM

In recent years, the MDE has made several revisions to the required educator evaluation system, resulting most recently in the development and adoption of the Mississippi Professional Growth System (PGS), which was implemented during the 2016-17 school term. The PGS is required of all districts and schools in Mississippi. The MDE will offer school and district leaders ongoing training in the understanding and implementation of the PGS (rubric use, educator observation processes, and coaching conversations). While data from the educator evaluation system has not been extensively used at the state level in the past, the state has begun developing professional development sessions aligned to the expectations of the PGS. The MDE will review statewide trend data during the summer of 2017 and will provide training sessions aligned to strategic areas that need to be addressed through professional development for teachers. As a result, principals will be able to better align teacher professional development with specific needs based on prior evaluation results.

In their proposals to the Mississippi Charter School Authorizer Board (MCSAB), charter schools are required to include the school's leadership and teacher employment policies, including performance evaluation plans. As a result, approved charter schools are not required to use the PGS and may use the performance evaluation system outlined in their charter proposal.

Educator evaluation in Mississippi is designed to identify strengths and areas for growth in an educator's practice and to provide feedback for improvement. To accomplish this broad goal requires the MDE to continuously review and refine the Mississippi educator evaluation system to ensure that educators are provided valuable information about their practice. Well-designed and implemented evaluation systems provide critical information to the MDE and school districts to inform decision making and improve teaching.

The PGS was developed in conjunction with a diverse group of stakeholders. Beginning in the fall of 2015, the MDE assembled this group to review and recommend refinements to the educator evaluation systems as a part of the Educator and Leader Effectiveness Steering Committee. Steering committee members were recruited through the MDE's monthly Research and Development newsletter and educator associations (Mississippi Association of Educators, Mississippi Professional Educators, and Jackson Federation of Teachers). Approximately 430 stakeholders expressed interest in serving on the Steering Committee. A priority in establishing this committee was to seek input from a diverse group of educators from the entire state. To accomplish this, the committee was assembled with great deliberation to ensure there was diversity in congressional district, grade level, subject area, years of experience, gender, and race. The committee was divided into Tiers 1 and 2. Tier 1 was made up of 52 participants who participated in a series of five face-to-face monthly meetings from November 2015 – March 2016. Stakeholders who were not selected to participate in Tier 1 were given

the opportunity to provide input electronically as Tier 2 members; 163 stakeholders agreed to serve on Tier 2.

The Steering Committee was divided into six subcommittees, each representing an evaluation process for specific educators (teachers, principals, counselors, librarians, speech-language pathologists, and student services coordinators). Subcommittees were created so that sufficient attention was paid to the details of each evaluation system. The subcommittees submitted their recommendations to the MDE and were given the opportunity to gather feedback from the full committee. Each subcommittee consisted of a chair and members with experience and vested interest in the evaluation systems refinement process.

Over the course of the five meetings, the Steering Committee explored research-based evaluation component options. After a review of the literature on these components, the Steering Committee submitted recommendations to include the components below into the system. Below is research to support the use of each of the components.

### **Teacher Evaluation System Components**

#### **Student Surveys**

Student surveys are scheduled to be implemented in the PGS during the 2018-19 school year. The research report *MET Project: Gathering Feedback for Teaching*, provides an analysis of the teaching practice of 1,333 teachers in six school districts throughout the country. The teachers represent a subset of those studied in the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) Project. The researchers concluded that student feedback, when combined with classroom observations and student outcomes, improved reliability and predictive power.

#### **Classroom Observations Using the PGS**

Classroom observations using the PGS were implemented during the 2016-17 school year. Observation tools in the PGS include standards that address how well teachers and leaders are meeting the needs of diverse student populations. In a study of the Cincinnati Public Schools' Teacher Evaluation System (TES) using observation records between the 2000-01 and 2008-09 school years, Kane, Taylor, Tyler, & Wooten (2011) concluded that the teachers' classroom practices, as measured by TES scores (based on the Danielson Framework for Teaching), predicted differences in student achievement. The study revealed that teachers with higher observation ratings also yielded higher student outcomes. The results of this study suggest a relationship between teachers' observation results and student achievement (Kane, Taylor, Tyler, & Wooten, 2011)

#### **Student Outcomes**

Student Outcome measures will be implemented during the 2018-19 school year. Research has suggested that teacher value-added models can accurately predict a teachers' impact on student outcomes. Researchers used a random-assignment experiment in Los Angeles Unified School District to evaluate various non-

experimental methods for estimating teacher effects on student test scores. Having estimated teacher effects during a pre-experimental period, researchers used these estimates to predict student achievement following random assignment of teachers to classrooms. The researchers' analysis suggested that standard teacher value-added models are able to generate unbiased and reasonably accurate predictions of the causal short-term impact of a teacher on student test scores (Kane & Staiger, 2008).

### **Administrator Evaluation System Components**

#### **School Site Observations & 360-degree feedback tool (i.e., the Circle Survey)**

School site observations were implemented in the 2016-17 school year. A 360-degree feedback tool will be implemented during the 2018-19 school year. Clifford & Ross (2012a) identified multiple measures that should be included in a principal evaluation system. These measures include professional qualities and practices, professional growth and learning, school culture and climate, stakeholder satisfaction, and student educational outcomes. The researchers also emphasized the importance of using multiple measures when evaluating principals (Clifford and Ross, 2012b). "Due to the complexity of a principal's job, principals want and need substantive feedback that is comprehensive, accurate, valid, and useful. Areas of performance must be identified using comprehensive data gathered from multiple sources" (Clifford & Ross, 2012b, p. 37).

In order to strengthen professional practice, school administrators need timely, meaningful feedback. The information gained from a 360 Feedback Survey component will assist in goal-setting between administrators and their supervisors and will allow administrators to modify their practice to benefit their school communities and their students' growth. In order to assess principals' performance, principal supervisors, instructional staff, and principals will complete the 360 Feedback Survey. The survey will be developed during the 2017-18 school year for implementation during the 2018-19 school year.

#### **Student Outcomes**

Student outcomes will be implemented in the 2018-19 school year. New Leaders for New Schools conducted a comprehensive literature review on evaluating principals. The organization identified four strategies for improving principal evaluation systems: (1) make student outcomes and teacher effectiveness outcomes 70% of a principal's evaluation and the remaining 30% on leadership actions shown to drive better results; (2) base the evaluation of principal managers and other central office staff primarily on student outcomes and principal effectiveness; (3) develop performance expectations that are universally high and differentiated in ways that drive continuous improvement; and (4) ensure that the evaluation system is informed by principals and other experts.

### **Board Policy**

The recommendations of the committee resulted in a State Board policy (Part 3, Chapter 14, Rule 14.9: Educator and Principal Evaluation System). The [Mississippi Educator and Administrator Professional Growth System](#) will provide summative feedback annually to certified staff and administrators. The system is focused on improving both professional practice and student outcomes by providing certified staff and administrators with feedback to inform continuous improvement at the classroom, school, district, and state levels. The PGS' observation tools include standards that address how well teachers and leaders are meeting the needs of diverse student populations.

### **PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT MENU OF SERVICES**

In addition to the development of sessions based on PGS outcomes, the MDE presently offers a menu of services, describing professional development available on demand to all educators in Mississippi's public schools. These sessions, which can be requested through the MDE, are designed to improve educator effectiveness and meet the needs of diverse student population. The skills that are addressed in current and future trainings will increase the achievement of all students.

The menu of services was initially developed in 2014, and it has been revised and expanded regularly since its deployment, based on post-training feedback from educators as well as requests for new topics. Content areas in the menu include English language arts, writing, mathematics, literacy, science, social studies, co-teaching, special education, and the PGS. Additionally, sessions focus on topics such as instructional unit development, scaffolding document use to improve instruction for struggling learners, and effective assessment practices.

Beyond the on-demand menu of services described above, the MDE offers regular training on current, relevant topics such as standards-based instruction (reading/language arts, math, science, and social studies), Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, IEP development, counseling services, evidence-based interventions, and the PGS. These engaging and interactive face-to-face sessions are available to educators at no cost. The MDE hosts sessions regionally to increase access for educators and reduce travel costs for districts.

Both the menu of services and the regional trainings described above are deliberately focused on improving student achievement by improving classroom instruction and related student services.

The MDE is also planning to use the funds to strengthen leadership development opportunities. The MDE will use the funds to provide school leaders with evidence-based training and support on providing teachers with high-quality feedback and instructional coaching. The MDE is focused on improving the capacity of existing school and district administrators and in developing the next generation of leaders to guide schools toward better outcomes for students. Through a revision of the Orientation for School Leaders processes and the development of expanded ongoing

professional development offerings for school administrators, the MDE will carry out this effort in support of the MBE Strategic Plan.

## **2. USE OF FUNDS TO IMPROVE EQUITABLE ACCESS TO TEACHERS IN TITLE I, PART A SCHOOLS (ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(E))**

If an SEA plans to use Title II, Part A funds to improve equitable access to effective teachers, consistent with ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B), describe how such funds will be used for this purpose.

### **TEACHER WORKFORCE**

The Mississippi State Board of Education’s Strategic Plan outlines clear goals for advancing public education in the State of Mississippi. Goal 4 of the plan specifically addresses teacher and leader effectiveness by ensuring “effective teachers and leaders in every school.” Although the strategic plan focuses on addressing student achievement by improving the effectiveness of teachers and leaders, the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) recognizes the importance and urgency of addressing the teacher workforce disparities in the state.

During the 2016-17 school year, approximately 73% of Mississippi teachers are white, while 56% of public school students are from ethnic minority groups (Black, Asian, Pacific Islander, Hispanic, Native American, and two or more races). Male teachers accounted for approximately 20% of the teacher workforce, but only 6% of those are from ethnic minority groups. Given the emergence of recent research on the impact of minority teachers on the achievement of minority students, the disparities between the student and teacher populations reveal an opportunity for the MDE to implement strategies to diversify the teacher pipeline. In a recent study, Gerthersan, Hart, Lindsay, & Papageorgen (2017) found that having just one black teacher in 3rd, 4th, or 5th grade reduced low-income black boys' probability of dropping out of high school by 39%. The study also found that these students were more likely to take college entrance exams. In their report, Gerthersan, et al. (2017) noted that the findings suggest that “a straightforward policy lever – assignment of black male students to black teachers – can help to close frustratingly persistent achievement gaps” (page 36). The impact of minority teachers on the achievement of minority students is evident in other studies. Goldhaber and Hansen (2009) found evidence that black teachers have more consistent success than their white counterparts in teaching black students. The researchers also found that black teachers scoring on the lower end on the Praxis exam distribution had even greater success with black students (Goldhaber and Hansen, 2009). In its review of existing research, the Alfred Shanker Institute (2014) suggested that minority teachers not only have a positive impact on minority students, but all students benefit from a diverse teacher workforce. In addition to reducing stereotypes and unconscious implicit biases,

having teachers from diverse backgrounds also helps to prepare students to live in an increasingly diverse society (Alfred Shanker Institute, 2014).

By 2025, the MDE has set a goal of increasing the number of minority teachers in critical shortage school districts by 25%, better reflecting the student population in these districts. A 25% increase in the number of minority teachers will result in a percentage increase from 53% to 67%. In addition, it is also important that all teachers in the state become culturally responsive in their practice. In order to ensure equitable access of effective teachers for minority students and those from low-income households, the MDE must implement a set of strategies designed to attract, prepare, and support/retain minority teachers. Implementing strategies that address the diversification of the teacher workforce, engagement with stakeholders, particularly those most impacted by critical teacher shortages, is essential. The MDE will include vertical teams from the critical shortage school districts in the work of the DTP team. Administrators and teachers in these districts are experts on the issues and challenges impacting the recruitment and retention of minority teachers in their districts. Engagement and collaboration with these school districts are required to effectively address and monitor progress towards the elimination of recruitment/retention barriers. This collaboration is an essential component in the success of the MDE's strategies.

The MDE has initiated the process of connecting the work of the Office of Educator Accountability with that of the Office of Educator Licensure. As a result of the examination of the agency's work and the alignment of the work to the strategic plan, many of the strategies are already in progress. All the strategies in this plan will be managed by the combined Offices of Educator Accountability and Licensure. Title II, Part A funds will be used to support these strategies when appropriate.

The strategies outlined attempt to address some of the systemic challenges impeding the recruitment and retention of minority teachers in Mississippi. Although many of the strategies also address the teacher shortages in the state rather than specifically addressing diversifying the teacher workforce, these two issues are not mutually exclusive. In Mississippi, as in many states in the country, minority students are disproportionately impacted by teacher shortages. Minority teachers, according to the research literature, are more likely to teach in schools with large minority student populations, but are also more likely to leave the profession. This can often create a revolving door in schools with the most vulnerable children. In school districts with the most challenging teacher pipeline issues, the strategies in this plan will effect change in the diversity of the teacher workforce. The strategies to address these issues were identified by a broad group of stakeholders and presented in Mississippi's Equitable Access to Excellent Educators State Plan (Equity Plan).

### **ATTRACTING TEACHERS – GROW-YOUR-OWN INITIATIVE**

In the article, *The Grow-Your-Own Imperative*, Brown (2016) wrote,

More than 60% of America's teachers work within 20 miles of where they went to high school. In every community, most of the future teaching workforce is sitting on the student side of the desks right now—with or without any kind of proactive recruitment efforts. Because we know where each community's future teachers are largely coming from, communities have a clear, inherent self-interest in providing opportunities to help guide young people on a well-supported path to teaching. Homegrown teachers are vital assets who must be nurtured and developed—and that means starting early (p. 51).

The MDE will provide guidance and technical assistance to districts to support the development and implementation of the Grow-Your-Own initiative. These programs create a teacher workforce pipeline for students, paraprofessionals, and other community members. The Grow-Your-Own initiative also works to create a sustainable pipeline of educators who are members of the community in which they teach, particularly in urban and isolated rural districts. Additional goals of this initiative are as follows:

- Create pipeline of effective teachers.
- Improve teacher retention in low-income schools.
- Recruit for hard-to-staff schools and hard-to-fill positions.
- Increase cultural competence and community connections of teachers.

The Grow-Your-Own initiative represents an innovative partnership of educator preparation programs (EPPs) and school districts to help paraprofessionals and emergency substitutes in high-minority and low-income communities to become certified. Studies indicate teachers have a strong preference to teach close to home; the Grow-Your-Own initiative seeks to change the systemic nature of teacher shortages by guiding people from these communities to become teachers. The Grow-Your-Own initiative works to address the dual goals of alleviating the teacher shortage crisis while improving workforce diversity to better reflect the P-12 student population (Albert Shanker Institute, 2005).

Mississippi's Grow-Your-Own initiative is being designed to create a pipeline of highly effective teachers and to improve teacher retention in the districts with high teacher attrition. It will be a partnership of teacher/community organizations, institutions of higher learning (IHLs), school districts, and the MDE that support paraprofessionals and non-licensed school district personnel to become effective teachers. The MDE's goal is to provide guidance, strategies, and support for school districts to establish and maintain a local Grow-Your-Own initiative. To support this goal, the MDE will:

- Convene a Task Force to develop a Grow-Your-Own program structure that school districts and EPPs can utilize.
- Facilitate the partnership between the Grow-Your-Own programs and EPPs.
- Maintain ongoing communication with Grow-Your-Own participants to track their progress from teacher preparation programs to the classroom.



- Partner with districts to recruit their non-licensed staff and community members.

Another goal is to implement a Grow-Your-Own initiative in all critical shortage school districts to actively recruit teachers from paraprofessionals, classified employees, members of their local communities, and students by 2025 and then expand to other districts throughout the state. Many of the critical shortage school districts are in communities with large minority populations. In the Grow-Your-Own initiative, districts recruit aspiring teachers from the communities they serve. By drawing from their local communities, successfully implemented Grow-Your-Own programs in the critical school districts will positively impact the number of minority teachers.

To accomplish this goal, the Grow-Your-Own Task Force will convene in fall 2018 to develop a structure for the program. The task force will include representatives of the EPPs, critical shortage school districts, and educator associations.

The Grow-Your-Own initiative is an umbrella that includes three strategies, all aimed at developing a sustainable teacher workforce in communities with the greatest critical shortage challenges. These strategies include developing and/or strengthening Teacher Academies and Educators Rising chapters in critical shortage school districts, developing a structured partnership between critical shortage school districts and EPPs, and the development of community college partnerships with EPPs.

### **Teacher Academies and Educators Rising**

Because current high school students are a significant pool of future teachers, a strategy in attracting and recruiting future minority teachers, particularly those in communities with large minority student populations, is to encourage, foster and support students who have expressed interest in teaching. Teacher Academy programs and Educators Rising chapters are designed to do just that.

The MDE currently coordinates Teacher Academy programs and Educators Rising chapters (formerly known as Future Educators Association) to identify students interested in education. The Teacher Academy program, managed by MDE's Office of Career and Technical Education (CTE), is a high school program with courses designed to attract students to the field of education, to provide information and field experiences relevant to pursuing a degree in education, and to prepare students for the rigors of a career in education so they will remain long-term educators. The Teacher Academy pathway includes classroom and hands-on experiences that will prepare students for an educator preparation program and a career in education.

Educators Rising is an organization that provides prospective teachers the experience and skills they need to be ready for the classroom. Starting with high school students, Educators Rising provides passionate young people with hands-

on teaching experience, sustains their interest in the profession, and helps them cultivate the skills they need to be successful educators. The result is a pipeline of well-prepared teachers who are positioned to make a lasting difference — not only in the lives of their students, but also in the field of teaching more broadly.

To strengthen these programs, the Mississippi Department of Education will:

- Collaborate with EPPs to develop incentives for Teacher Academy completers majoring in education.
- Maintain ongoing communication with Teacher Academy and Educators Rising members to track their progress from the program, to teacher preparation programs, to the classroom.
- Facilitate the promotion of teacher education programs within the Teacher Academies and Educators Rising chapters to encourage members to major in education.
- Partner with critical shortage districts to assist with the establishment of an Educators Rising and/or Teacher Academy chapter.
- Attend regional meetings hosted by local Educators Rising chapters to disseminate information regarding scholarships other teaching incentives and to promote the profession.
- Build relationships with the members and help to guide them into the classroom.
- Encourage community colleges' departments of education and EPPs to develop partnerships with Teacher Academies and/or Educator Rising chapters to recruit students into their program.

The goal of the MDE is to have active Teacher Academies and/or Educators Rising chapters in every critical shortage school district and in 75% of the states' high schools. South Carolina's High School Teacher Cadet Program has been utilized to successfully introduce the teaching profession to minority high school students (Hanover Research, 2014). Since its inception, the program has been expanded to approximately 73% of South Carolina high schools. An analysis of the program revealed that one in five participants has gone on to earn teacher certification after participating in the program (Hanover Research, 2014). Mississippi will establish a target of 25% of Teacher Academy and Educators Rising students to earn certification by 2025. Currently, students in the program are not tracked after graduating, but will be in future years. The Office of Educator Accountability is responsible for the implementation of the plan and measuring progress towards goals.

### **Paraprofessional and Classified Staff Recruitment**

To promote paraprofessional/classified staff recruitment, the MDE will support partnerships between school districts and EPPs. The initiative will guide

paraprofessionals, classified staff members, and unlicensed teachers (teachers who are teaching but not licensed to teach in subject area) to earn certification through a traditional or alternate route preparation program. To ensure participants' success and retention, the partnership will provide a full array of student services including advising, coaching, and tuition assistance, mentoring in school districts, and guided induction to the teaching profession.

#### Goals of Strategy

1. Internal capacity of high-need school districts will be increased by:
  - Providing district with “home grown” teachers who will stay in the profession as a result of their deep roots in the community.
  - Identifying and training mentor teachers who support future generations of teachers.
  - Opening doors for continued professional learning opportunities for the teachers and mentors.
2. Increased capacity of partner alternative licensure programs by:
  - Providing resources and supports that contribute to the rigor of their program.
3. Increased capacity in the SEA by:
  - Maintaining and enhancing existing partnerships and resources among critical shortage school districts, EPPs, and alternative licensure programs.
  - Facilitating the development of new partnerships where they currently do not exist.
4. Increased capacity of the field by:
  - Providing data to other districts who would build similar programs.
  - Using rigorous evaluation methods to provide results on the effectiveness of the strategy.

#### **Community College Partnerships**

Community colleges represent a relatively untapped pool of potential teachers. By some estimates, nearly half of community college students are from minority groups. In addition, a series of studies conducted from 1999 through 2001 revealed that nearly one-fifth of all candidates entering the teaching force began their post-high school education at the community college level, and that more than half of the community colleges have dedicated teacher preparation programs.

Innovative programs such as the 2 Plus 2 Program that is offered through a partnership between Hinds Community College (HCC) and Delta State University (DSU) is an example of a community college and educator preparation program collaborative. Hinds Community College in Mississippi signed a 2-plus-2 agreement with Delta State University to offer junior and senior level courses for

a bachelor's degree in Elementary Education and the Childhood Development Program. Central Mississippi area students who wish to complete their Elementary Education degree can take classes at a designated Hinds campus, by way of traditional classroom, video conferencing and online. Programs such as this are the most common approach taken by community colleges involved in teacher preparation. A strength of the 2-plus-2 approach is that community colleges with teacher preparation programs can become a feeder into an educator preparation program by coordinating with an IHL (Coulter and Vandal, 2007). Participants of such partnerships benefit from having streamlined matriculation alternatives and an aligned community college and IHL educator curriculum.

Hinds Community College Administrators/Faculty agree to provide the following:

- Recruitment (including promotion and marketing of the program) and identification of candidates for the Child Development Program (CDP)
- Advisement of prospective CDP candidates pursuant to prerequisites/guidelines established for the program
- Provision of course offerings at HCC that will enable students on track in the CDP to complete the 62 hours of identified coursework to be offered at HCC
- Consultation with the appointed HCC Coordinator and Administration/Faculty at DSU, College of Education and Human Sciences, regarding visibility of the program, marketing, planning, and related items each semester and on an as-needed basis
- Facilitation of technology and media resources for students to collaborate with their professors

Delta State University Administrators/Faculty (College of Education and Human Sciences) agree to provide the following:

- Promotion/marketing of the CDP in the community-at-large and area schools
- Advisement of students who have met prerequisites for enrollment through study at HCC
- Coordination of program components to be offered through DSU at HCC
- Consultation with the appointed DSU Coordinator and Administration/Faculty at HCC regarding visibility of the program, marketing, planning, and related items each semester and on an as-needed basis

The HCC/DSU is an example of a community college and educator preparation program collaborative at work to increase the teacher pipeline in Mississippi. Because of the large number of minority students enrolled in community colleges (by some estimates, nearly 50% of community college students are from minority groups), such partnerships have the potential to attract minority students to the

teaching profession. The MDE's goal is to have similar partnerships with EPPs at all of the community colleges in the state by 2025.

## **SUPPORTING TEACHERS**

Nationally, minority teachers are being hired at a higher proportion than their white counterparts, but the teacher workforce disparities are the result of the higher attrition rates of minority teachers. Nationally, attrition is, in fact, negating gains made by recruitment efforts. For instance, in the 2003-2004 school year, 47,000 new minority teachers entered the workforce, but in the 2004-2005 school year, 56,000 chose to leave the profession (Ingersoll and May, 2011).

Minority teachers are disproportionately employed in predominantly urban, predominantly poor, and predominantly high-minority schools. However, Ingersoll and May (2011) found that a school's demographic characteristics appeared to have little impact on a minority teacher's decision to leave a school. The researchers found that job dissatisfaction, a lack of classroom autonomy, and a lack of collective faculty decision-making were primary reasons for the attrition of minority teachers. Because of the attrition of teachers in high-minority and low-income schools, there is a large number of inexperienced teachers.

All teachers need support and development throughout their careers, but novice teachers are in the greatest need. The MDE is addressing many of these needs through the development of a tiered licensure system that includes induction and mentoring for new teachers as described in D.1. The strategies outlined in this section will improve the support of all teachers, but because of the higher attrition of minority teachers, strategies to support them is essential in increasing retention.

## **TEACHER LEADERSHIP**

The goal of the Teacher Leadership Initiative is to provide effective teachers with opportunities to teach students and collaboratively lead colleagues to improve their practice. Research reveals that one of the most significant reasons for high minority teacher attrition is a lack of shared decision-making in their schools. Teacher Leadership will provide teachers with opportunities to share in the decision-making. The Office of Educator Accountability has assembled a task force of educators to develop a teacher leadership model for the state. The task force group voted to adopt the national Teacher Leadership Exploratory Consortium Standards.

### **Theory of Action**

If we develop a tangible teacher leadership model, then Mississippi can develop the capacity and opportunity for teachers to serve as leaders. Effective, well-trained teacher leaders will help to strengthen instructional practice, positively impact student achievement, and serve as advocates for the profession.

### **Task Force Goals**

1. Provide teachers opportunities for leadership (increased career pathways/ladders).
2. Improve teacher retention by providing teachers with leadership opportunities that don't require that they leave the classroom.
3. Provide effective teachers with opportunities to extend their reach through flexible scheduling and compensation for leadership roles.
4. Provide teacher leaders with opportunities to positively impact student outcomes and growth.
5. Offer a teacher leadership licensure endorsement.
6. Provide guidance to school districts on how to innovatively use Title II funds to provide stipends to teacher leaders.
7. Allow teacher leaders to serve as instructional coaches and mentor teachers, but not in a school administrative capacity.

Using Title II funds, the MDE will provide technical assistance and training to districts on implementing structured induction and mentoring programs.

Currently, the MDE provides mentor training materials, but offers no regional training to district leaders on the implementation of the training. The partnership with the CEEDAR Center should result in a mandated induction and mentoring programs for all districts with the MDE providing training to districts virtually and face-to-face.

### 3. SYSTEM OF CERTIFICATION AND LICENSING (*ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(B)*)

Describe the State's system of certification and licensing of teachers, principals, or other school leaders.

All local school district professional positions requiring licensed staff, must be filled by educators that are properly licensed and endorsed in accordance with Mississippi educators must meet licensure guidelines established and required by the State Board of Education and state law, as appropriate. requirements as certified teachers and administrators to be highly qualified. The [Guidelines for Licensure K-12 Licensure Guidelines K12 | The Mississippi Department of Education \(mdek12.org\)](#) is a handbook of all licensure requirements approved by the Mississippi State Board of Education for all types of teacher and administrator license types. licensure and certification required by law. All changes to licensure guidelines changes require action by the State Board of Education. The MDE is partnering with the Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability and Reform (The CEEDAR Center) to address certain licensure and educator preparation policy needs. CEEDAR-MS project focuses on: a) improving teacher and leader preparation programs; b) revising certain licensure standards; and c) aligning policy structures and professional learning systems. This project is addressed further in section 6. Charter schools must comply with applicable federal laws, rules and regulations regarding the qualification of teachers and other instructional staff. No more than

25% of teachers in a charter school may be exempt from state teacher licensure requirements. Administrators of charter schools are exempt from state administrator licensure requirements. However, teachers and administrators must have a bachelor's degree as a minimum requirement, and teachers must have demonstrated subject-matter competency. Within three (3) years of a teacher's employment by a charter school, the teacher must have, at a minimum, alternative licensure approved by the Commission on Teacher and Administrator Education, Certification and Licensure and Development.

#### **4. IMPROVING SKILLS OF EDUCATORS** (*ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(J)*)

Describe how the SEA will improve the skills of teachers, principals, or other school leaders in order to enable them to identify students with specific learning needs, particularly children with disabilities, English learners, students who are gifted and talented, and students with low literacy levels, and provide instruction based on the needs of such students.

The MDE has had a focused effort on literacy, especially since the adoption of the *Literacy-Based Promotion Act* in 2013. This state law has placed requirements on students in the area of reading as a basis for promotion to 4th grade. Additionally, state funding connected to this law has allowed the MDE to train Pre-K through 3rd grade teachers, special education teachers through 8th grade, and K-5 elementary principals on reading instruction based on the five core components of reading.

##### **EARLY CHILDHOOD TRAINING**

Since 2014, the state has supported professional development for early childhood educators whether they work in a public-school program, a Head Start program, or a private setting. The MDE has partnered with Head Start to offer a statewide conference each summer in order to provide consistent, high-quality content focused on standards-based instruction, thematic centers, school readiness expectations, effective scheduling, developmentally appropriate practice, and similar topics. A two-week, intensive training session for early childhood teachers, assistants, and administrators **is offered in the summer, and in 2023 the session will be offered in ten locations across the state.** Additionally, the MDE provides regional training sessions throughout the year and across the state to foster continuous professional growth. Through a grant from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the MDE **expanded** support for early childhood educators across the state. The grant **supports** teachers statewide in a variety of pre-K settings to implement developmentally appropriate practices in their classrooms. Major grant activities include professional development and coaching support, pre-K program evaluation to ensure program quality and student progress, the implementation of developmental assessments for students, and assistance with increasing parents' participation in their children's education.

##### **~~LETRS TRAINING~~ Science of Reading Professional Learning**

~~The statewide professional development system used to increase the knowledge and~~

skills of teachers in their ability to teach reading is the *Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling* (LETRS). This training is a hybrid model of online and face-to-face sessions that allows for self-paced learning of the content. The LETRS professional development sessions provide educators with a core understanding of language structure and helps them gain in-depth instructional information to complement their teaching practices. Rather than replacing the core basal reading program, LETRS brings deeper knowledge of reading instruction by addressing each component—phoneme awareness; phonics, decoding, spelling, and word study; oral language development; vocabulary; reading fluency; comprehension; and writing. This course of improving reading instruction:

- Builds a bridge between research and practice;
- Cultivates knowledge about teaching literacy and language;
- Develops teachers' ability to diagnose and overcome students' reading challenges;
- Provides practical strategies that work for every type of learner;
- Increases effectiveness of core reading and supplementary instruction; and,
- Engages teachers with real-world application and interesting questions.

Principals also had the opportunity to attend the *Principal's Primer for Raising Reading Achievement*, the complement to LETRS professional development. This training provides a “how-to” manual for principals who want to improve the school's overall reading performance. It explains in very practical terms exactly how a principal can lead a school to implement research-based, multi-tier reading instruction and achieve optimal results, especially with students from economically, socially, or educationally disadvantaged backgrounds. *A Principal's Primer for Raising Reading Achievement* gives a series of specific steps for principals to follow which include: providing focus specifically on the role of the principal in teaching literacy; giving the nuts and bolts of what to do with whom; how to get the work done, and how to monitor the school's progress toward shared goals; identifying specific resources and materials of value within a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS); and, learning from the expertise of leaders who earned national and state recognition for outstanding school improvement. In 2014 the MDE procured a statewide professional development system with the hope of supporting teacher acquisition of knowledge and skills around their ability to teach reading. This system was Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS). This training was a hybrid model of online and face-to-face sessions that allowed for self-paced learning of the content. Professional development sessions provided educators with a core understanding of language structure and helped them gain in-depth reading knowledge to complement their teaching practices.

In the fall of 2022, the MDE revised the focus for professional learning to place a stronger emphasis on the Science of Reading (SoR) and the application of the SoR



through a structured Literacy model of instruction. The statewide professional development for K-3 Reading continues to support Mississippi teachers in their ability to effectively teach reading. This system is an International Dyslexia Association (IDA) accredited professional learning course and is designed for educators committed to learning about the connection between reading research, theoretical models, such as the Simple View of Reading and Scarborough's Reading Rope, and best practices for language and literacy instruction in the classroom.

### **MTSS AND PBIS**

The MDE revised its approach to identification of students for tiered instructional supports during the 2014-15 school year, and a number of professional development sessions have been hosted across the state focused on district-level teams, school-level teams, and teacher teams. Through this training, processes have been streamlined to focus more on student interventions and less on required paperwork.

The State Board of Education adopted the Three Tier Instructional Model in January 2005 and revised this model in August 2016. In addition, the Office of Intervention Services (OIS) was established in February of 2014 and has developed various professional development modules that strategically focus on teacher and classroom practices. These modules include evidence-based practices and principles, as well as multi-tiered intervention strategies for academics and behavior. The MDE, through the OIS, has offered regional trainings on MTSS for school-level teams, district-level teams, and teachers. Districts were encouraged to send school teams that included a principal, special education lead teacher, general education lead teacher, interventionist, and counselor to ensure diverse representation of all grade levels. Participants brought school- and classroom-level data as it related to Tier distribution, attendance, retention, behavior referral, diversity, growth of diverse populations, and available intervention supports. In these interactive sessions, participants were provided an overview of Mississippi's new MTSS. Guidance was offered on how schools can build the necessary infrastructure needed to establish and sustain systematic supports. Strategies on how to effectively use available data and resources to successfully target student supports and complete the required documentation were shared.

The MDE also developed an Early Warning System (EWS) Guidance document to assist districts and schools with addressing behavioral issues. When providing onsite technical assistance, we request that participating school teams bring readily available district and school data so that we can utilize and discuss the key indicators such as attendance, course performance (for both teachers and students), behavior, school climate, over representation of groups within the school, students with or without disabilities, gender, and race specific data. From this data, we then determine what additional supports and guidance are needed for individual schools

and districts to support the identification of students at risk of missing key educational milestones. The MDE teaches districts to evaluate the data to recognize factors that are negatively impacting student learning and behavior as well as to provide supports and interventions to help get students back on track in school, and ultimately, to graduate. In addition, the MDE has a State Personnel Development grant with REACH MS to provide extensive targeted MTSS-behavior training and ongoing technical assistance for PBIS. They specifically provide guidance in conjunction with the MDE on selecting, administering, and using local school and district behavioral data as well as surveying to make decisions pertaining to the Tier process.

To support parent engagement, OIS created the [\*Family Guide for Student Success\*](#). Each school received hard copies of the book, designed for each grade level, Pre-K – 8. The book includes ways for parents to encourage their children’s academic growth by reinforcing classroom activities at home; details what all students should know and be able to do at the end of each grade; and lists expectations that will help students meet assessment standards. The OIS mission to include parents has led schools to become more intentional about engaging with families.

Through support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the MDE has offered regional training sessions for educators entitled Providing Engaging Experiences to Parents. This “train-the-trainer” module was designed to assist schools in their efforts to support K-5 parents in using at-home activities that reinforce the English, language arts, and mathematics standards and that incorporate materials that are typically available in the homes of many families. Each participating district team received a training kit that included: a sample training agenda, PowerPoint presentation, a sample flyer to announce the training, tips for hosting a successful parent night, and sample pre-made activities.

~~To support students with disabilities, the MDE has utilized a Schoolwide Integrated Framework for Transformation (SWIFT) grant.~~ Schoolwide Integrated Framework for Transformation (SWIFT) was launched in October 2012 with funding from the Office of Special Education Programs at the United States Department of Education. It was a \$24.5 million effort to provide national K-8 technical assistance to urban, rural, and high need school districts to improve academic and behavioral instruction and support all students with disabilities and those with the most extensive needs. SWIFT engages in partnerships with state agencies, districts, schools, and communities to transform whole educational systems into teaching and learning environments that practice equity-based inclusion of all children. MDE was fortunate to receive a portion of the grant.

The SWIFT grant enables the MDE to strategically enhance the efforts of the OIS to support districts, teachers, schools, as well as community organizations through professional development and resources.

## ELs

The MDE has hired ~~three~~ individuals who have a strong background in working with ELs. Since the beginning of 2016, the MDE has expanded regional trainings for teachers working with ELs and has offered ongoing technical assistance to districts with an EL population. Training for teachers and paraprofessionals has focused on instructional practices for building academic vocabulary, as well as information on language acquisition. Additionally, cultural competency training sessions were held in the summer of 2017. Differentiated technical support has been provided to federal programs directors and EL directors and coordinators, with a targeted focus on equipping leaders to evaluate their programs and practices. The MDE is moving toward the adoption of EL Proficiency standards, and staff will begin conducting professional development on the newly adopted standards during the 2017-18 school year. ~~The MDE adopted English language proficiency standards in July of 2021. Alternate English language proficiency standards for ELs with significant cognitive disabilities were also adopted at this time. Training on the standards was conducted in the 2022-23 school year in multiple locations around the state and is on-going.~~

## GIFTED

MDE staff with responsibility for gifted and talented services meet with gifted education teachers across the state through local onsite support and monitoring visits, and through opportunities provided by the mutually beneficial relationship between the agency and the Mississippi Association for Gifted Children. In the last 12 months, service to gifted and talented students has been improved by the adoption and implementation of new program outcomes and the establishment of annual regional trainings that allow teachers more access to department staff and other teachers of gifted children, as well as updated resources and classroom strategies. Along with the curriculum update, gifted program monitoring transitioned to a three-year cycle which allows local districts to address deficiencies and support student success through programming without gaps in compliance. Along with these changes, the department also trains general education teachers, principals, and local district staff on characteristics of gifted children, appropriate supports and strategies for all settings, and on statewide expectations, standards, and regulations.

## 5. DATA AND CONSULTATION *(ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(K))*

Describe how the State will use data and ongoing consultation as described in ESEA section 2102(d)(3) to continually update and improve the activities supported under Title II, Part A.

The MDE meets with the Educator Effectiveness Workgroup quarterly to discuss recently released data points as well as to evaluate and revise activities provided by

the State and supported by Title II-A funds. This workgroup consists of teachers, parents, administrators (principals and other school leaders), paraprofessionals (including organizations representing such individuals), specialized instructional support personnel, community partners, representatives from Institutions of Higher Learning within the state, and other organizations with relevant and demonstrated expertise in programs and activities designed to meet the purpose of Title II. The MDE is also inviting charter school leadership to participate in the workgroup. One of the major focuses of the workgroup is to continuously evaluate the effectiveness of current activities and ensure that educators' needs are being met. The MDE is transitioning to the PGS for teachers' and administrators' evaluations. ~~This tool will now include both teacher observation data as well as student outcomes.~~ This tool will now include both educator and administrator observation data while the MDE will continue to consider opportunities to introduce a multiple measure professional growth system to include teacher observations, student outcomes, and/or climate surveys as it modernizes statewide student and educator information systems.

As described in D.1 above, data from the educator evaluation system has not been extensively used at the state level in the past, but the state has begun developing professional development sessions aligned to the expectations of the PGS. The MDE will be reviewing statewide trend data during the summer of 2017 and providing training sessions aligned to strategic areas that need to be addressed through professional development for teachers. This will enable principals to better align teacher professional development with specific needs based on prior evaluation results. Additionally, the menu of services will continue to receive updates based on data from the PGS, allowing the state to respond to the needs of teachers with on-demand professional development tied to PGS outcomes.

## 6. TEACHER PREPARATION *(ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(M))*:

Describe the actions the State may take to improve preparation programs and strengthen support for teachers, principals, or other school leaders based on the needs of the State, as identified by the SEA.

The MDE has partnered with the **Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability, and Reform (The CEEDAR Center)**. The CEEDAR-MS Project State Leadership Team is made up of a diverse group of educational stakeholders representing General Education, Special Education, Educational Leadership and expanding to include additional members to reflect the diversity of our state. The CEEDAR-MS project focuses on: a) improving teacher and leader preparation programs; b) revising licensure standards; and c) aligning policy structures and professional learning systems. Through the collaborative efforts of the CEEDAR Center, the Mississippi Department of Education, ~~and~~ **educator preparation programs-providers, and other education stakeholders**, the following goals were developed to guide the work of the CEEDAR-MS project:

- Recommend to the Licensure Commission a tiered licensure system for teachers and leaders reflecting ongoing training and professional development to support all students (MBE Goal 4)
- Identify needs, structures, and leverage points to ensure sustainability and scale up of collaboration for teacher and leader preparation
- Integrate Evidence-based Practices (EBP) into Teacher and Leader Curriculum
- Increase faculty understanding and use of culturally responsive pedagogy
- Increase graduates' skills in using culturally responsive practices in the classroom
- Align content and practice opportunities across programs
- Implement Practice-to-Profession Partnership: Day-1-Ready, a model that increases practice-based opportunities for teacher education majors, in a selected school within a selected district
- Implement a thorough research review of the barriers in Mississippi that negatively impact the number and quality of new teacher candidates, with particular focus on teachers for students with disabilities
- Implement plan for recruitment and retention of teacher candidates

These efforts require strategic planning with groups of stakeholders that must include teachers, school and district leaders, superintendents, and educator preparation program personnel in order to strengthen all educator preparation programs **providers**, with the specific goals identified above including culturally responsive pedagogy included in all curricula.

## CITATIONS

Albert Shanker Institute. (2015). *The state of teacher diversity in American education*. Retrieved from the Albert Shanker Institute website:  
[http://www.shankerinstitute.org/sites/shanker/files/The%20State%20of%20Teacher%20Diversity\\_o.pdf](http://www.shankerinstitute.org/sites/shanker/files/The%20State%20of%20Teacher%20Diversity_o.pdf)

Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. (2012). *MET project: Gathering feedback for teaching*. Retrieved from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation Website:  
[http://k12education.gatesfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/MET\\_Gathering\\_Feedback\\_Research\\_Paper.pdf](http://k12education.gatesfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/MET_Gathering_Feedback_Research_Paper.pdf)

Brown, D. (2016). The grow your own imperative. *Educational Leadership*. Summer 2016 Digital Issue. Retrieved from  
[http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational\\_leadership/jun16/vol73/num09/The\\_Grow-Your-Own\\_Imperative.aspx](http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational_leadership/jun16/vol73/num09/The_Grow-Your-Own_Imperative.aspx)

Clifford, M., & Ross, S. (2012a). Rethinking principal evaluation. *Principal*, 1-31.

Clifford, M., & Ross, S. (2012b). The future of principal evaluation. *Principal*, 91(5),

16- 19.

Coulter, T., & Vandal, B. (2007, May). *Community colleges and teacher preparation: roles, issues, and opportunities*. (Issue brief No. PS-07-01). Retrieved April 14, 2017, from Education Commission of the States website:  
<http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/74/01/7401.pdf>

Gers Henson, S. Hart, C.M.D., Lindsay, C., & Papageorge, N. W. (2017). *The long-run impacts of same-race teachers*. (10630). Retrieved from  
<https://ideas.repec.org/p/iza/izadps/dp10630.html>

Hanover Research. (2014). *Recruiting and Retaining Diverse Personnel*. Retrieved from  
[http://scee.grouppsite.com/file\\_cabinet/files/690243/download/Recruiting%20and%20Retaining%20Diverse%20Personnel.pdf?m=1402065555](http://scee.grouppsite.com/file_cabinet/files/690243/download/Recruiting%20and%20Retaining%20Diverse%20Personnel.pdf?m=1402065555)

Ingersoll, R., & May, H. (2011, September). *Recruitment, Retention, and the Minority Teacher Shortage* (Rep.). doi:10.12698/cpre.2011.rr69

Ingersoll, R., & Smith, T. (2003). The wrong solution to the teacher shortage. *Educational Leadership*, 60(8). Retrieved from  
[http://www.gse.upenn.edu/pdf/rmi/EL\\_TheWrongSolution\\_to\\_theTeacherShortage.pdf](http://www.gse.upenn.edu/pdf/rmi/EL_TheWrongSolution_to_theTeacherShortage.pdf)

Kane, T.J., Taylor, E.S., Tyler, J.H., & Wooten, A.L. (2011, Summer). Evaluating teacher effectiveness. *Education Next*, 11(3), 54-60.

Kane, T. J., McCaffrey, D.F., Miller, T., and Staiger, D. O. (2013). *Have We Identified Effective Teachers? Validating Measures of Effective Teaching Using Random Assignment*, Seattle, WA: Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

Kane, T.J., and Staiger, D.O. (2008). Estimating Teacher Impacts on Student Achievement: An Experimental Evaluation. NBER Working Paper No. 14607.

New Leaders for New Schools. (2010). *Evaluating Principals: Balancing accountability with Professional Growth*. New York, NY.



## TITLE III, PART A, SUBPART 1

### English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement

*NOTE: Section E relates to MBE Strategic Plan Goals 1 and 2.*

#### 1. ENTRANCE AND EXIT PROCEDURES (ESEA section 3113(b)(2))

Describe how the SEA will establish and implement, with timely and meaningful consultation with LEAs representing the geographic diversity of the State, standardized, statewide entrance and exit procedures, including an assurance that all students who may be English learners are assessed for such status within 30 days of enrollment in a school in the State.

Title III in Mississippi services close to 12,000 students from many different countries and speaking many different languages. An English Learners (EL) Advisory Panel comprised of EL teachers, EL coordinators and directors, and school administrators who represent the geographic diversity of Mississippi has provided input on entrance and exit criteria and also offered feedback on needed professional development. The MDE works closely with school districts to ensure the needs of all English learners are being met, beginning with the timely identification of English learners. Districts are required to provide a Home Language Survey to all entering students, regardless of background. When a language other than English is indicated on a survey, the student is then administered the **English Language Proficiency LAS Links** screener within 30 days of enrollment at the beginning of the school year, or within two weeks if enrollment occurs later in the school year.

The state of Mississippi uses the **English Language Proficiency Test (ELPT) LAS Links Assessment System** to assess English language proficiency of English learners. To exit the EL program, a student must **attain level 4 or 5 in overall score, reading, and writing score a 4-5 Overall as well as in Reading and Writing on the ELPT. When new standards are in place, and the assessment has been determined to be aligned, the exit criteria may need to be adjusted. This adjustment will likely happen after the 2017-18 school term.**

#### PROGRESSION OF A STUDENT THROUGH THE EL PROGRAM

1. Enrollment in school and administration of Home Language Survey (HLS)
2. Identified as potential EL through HLS
3. **Takes the English Language Proficiency Test (Placement Test) Takes the LAS Links (Placement Test)** to determine English language proficiency (ELP) level and need for ESL services
4. Placement in an EL program of services
5. Annual assessment of ELP using **the ELPT. LAS Links.** Students are required to **required to attain level 4 or 5 in overall score, reading, and writing on the ELPT. achieve an overall proficiency level of 4 or higher, a writing proficiency level of 4 or higher, and a reading proficiency level of 4 or higher on the ELP Test to transition out of EL program.** Exit criteria were established after an

analysis of current ~~ELPT data, LAS Links data~~, as well as consultation with the state's EL Advisory Panel, which includes EL teachers, EL coordinators, parents, school and district administrators.

6. Monitor student's ability to participate meaningfully in mainstream classroom for 4 years.

## 2. SEA SUPPORT FOR ENGLISH LEARNER PROGRESS *(ESEA section 3113(b)(6))*

Describe how the SEA will assist eligible entities in meeting:

- i. The State-designed long-term goals established under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii), including measurements of interim progress towards meeting such goals, based on the State's English language proficiency assessments under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(G); and
- ii. The challenging State academic standards.

The state's long-term goal is that 70% of **English Learners (ELs)** will be making progress toward proficiency by 2024-25. The MDE leadership analyzed ~~LAS Links~~ELPT scores and guidance in understanding that English language proficiency is not acquired in a linear progression. Typical student progress toward proficiency is greater for students at lower levels of English language proficiency and slows significantly as students get closer to English language proficiency. As a result, individual student annual targets depend on current ~~LAS Links~~ELPT score.

MDE staff are collaborating with local schools and districts to strengthen instructional support offered to EL students, both through EL programs and through quality, Tier 1 instruction. A Professional Development Coordinator provides on-demand professional development and coaching to EL teachers, tutors and coordinators, as well as to general education teachers with EL students. The focus of this professional development is on equipping teachers to make academic content understandable to ELs, allowing students of varied language proficiency levels to meet the state's challenging academic standards. A variety of resources also have been produced to support teachers and administrators, including an EL guide for teachers and administrators and a series of webinars focusing on **the** best EL instructional practices. While not all Mississippi school districts participate in Title III funding, all school districts are held to the same academic standards for English learners. Additionally, the Office of Federal Programs is offering extensive, on-demand technical assistance to districts that express an interest in strengthening Title III programs. This support includes information on evidence-based interventions and on effective use of federal, state and local funds.



GROWTH TO ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY				
SUBGROUP	BASELINE DATA 2015-16	INTERIM MEASURE 2018-19	INTERIM MEASURE 2021-22	LONG-TERM GOAL 2024-25
English learners	48.3%	53.7%	61.9%	70.0%

### 3. MONITORING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE *(ESEA section 3113(b)(8))*

Describe:

- i. How the SEA will monitor the progress of each eligible entity receiving a Title III, Part A subgrant in helping English learners achieve English proficiency; and
- ii. The steps the SEA will take to further assist eligible entities if the strategies funded under Title III, Part A are not effective, such as providing technical assistance and modifying such strategies.

The SEA monitors the Title III program, ensuring that funds are used to advance the language acquisition of ELs. Monitoring includes an analysis of the use of funds and whether all fund uses are allowable. After the monitoring process, if a district’s Title III program is found to be out of compliance, the district receives additional technical support from the MDE’s Office of Federal Programs. Additionally, all districts are able to utilize EL technical assistance from the Office of Federal Programs, with an emphasis placed on ~~support~~ support for Federal Programs and Title III directors. District staff are supported in their development of needs ~~assessments, and assessments~~ and are encouraged to analyze EL assessment data when making decisions about programs and funding and writing their LEA plans.

Title III staff are also available to discuss EL program best practices. As described in E.2, a Professional Development Coordinator is available to provide additional coaching and training to EL teachers, regular classroom teachers and tutors.

The SEA monitors the Title III program, ensuring that funds are used to advance the language acquisition of ELs.

Annually, the SEA will:

- monitor EL data which will consist of EL counts and progress toward English proficiency,
- monitor how LEAs identify and exit EL students, and
- monitor how LEAs use Title III funds.

Every three years, the SEA will conduct a face-to-face monitoring visit with the LEA. The MDE will monitor the following areas.

- Expenditures
- LEA EL Plan
- Instructional programs
- Teacher trainings
- Program evaluation



## TITLE IV, PART A

### Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants

*NOTE: Section F relates to MBE Strategic Plan Goals 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.*

#### 1. USE OF FUNDS (ESEA section 4103(c)(2)(A))

Describe how the SEA will use funds received under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 for State-level activities.

The MDE will use funds received under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 for State-level priority activities to support LEAs in providing all students with access to a well-rounded education; improving the conditions of schools for students learning; and improving the use of technology in an effort to improve the academic achievement and digital literacy of all students. Funds will be used for administrative costs to provide technical assistance, capacity building, and monitoring of LEAs. Mississippi also has dozens of programs spanning birth through college and career to help ensure students have the skills they need to be successful and that the adults in the building are well supported.

### STATE LEVEL PRIORITY ACTIVITIES

#### **Well-Rounded Educational Opportunities**

Central to Mississippi's instructional approach is to ensure that every student in every school has access to educational opportunities that are well-rounded. LEA activities should include improving access to world languages and arts education (including dance, media arts, music, theatre, visual arts), supporting college and career counseling, including providing information on opportunities for financial aid through the early FAFSA, providing programming to engage all students in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM), including computer science, and strengthening instruction in American history, civics, economics, geography, government, and environmental education. The SEA will use state-level funds to promote access to accelerated learning opportunities including Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) programs, dual or concurrent enrollment programs and early college high schools.

#### **Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS)**

Originally implemented as a Response to Intervention model in 2005, and significantly revised in the 2015-16 school year, Mississippi's approach to MTSS is focused on high-quality classroom instruction and supports for academic and behavior for all students, with supplemental instruction, monitoring, and intervention for students who are not successful. The MDE supports districts and schools in the implementation of this state-required instructional model through professional development and guidance.

### **Building An Environment Suitable for Today’s Technology Needs**

Supporting teachers and school leaders in developing their acuity with technology is critical to creating a vibrant, relevant environment for our digital native students. MDE’s specific actions toward this goal include supporting high-quality professional development for educators, school leaders, and administrators to personalize learning and improve academic achievement. Creating a network strong and reliable enough to support 1:1 initiatives and blended learning projects requires districts to build technological capacity and infrastructure. The realities of a largely rural state require that MDE help provide students in remote and underserved areas with the resources to benefit from high-quality digital learning opportunities. Additionally, MDE leads the way in delivering specialized or rigorous academic courses and curricula using technology, including digital learning technologies and assistive technology.

In addition to State-level priority activities described above, the following is an overview of the emerging education ecosystem designed to provide an equitable education to all Mississippi students.

## **EARLY CHILDHOOD TO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

### **Early Learning Collaborative**

Mississippi’s state-funded Early Learning Collaborative program has provided local communities with the opportunity to fund high-quality four-year-old pre-K programs in communities across the state. In addition to the Early Learning Collaboratives, a number of districts are supporting early childhood programs funded through a blended approach, including local funds, federal funds, and partnerships with Head Start. The MDE supports districts in the implementation of high-quality pre-K programs through the development of guidance documents on topics such as appropriate use of available federal and local funds, pre-K standards and guidelines, student transitions, and developmentally appropriate instructional strategies. The MDE offers regularly scheduled professional development, a joint statewide conference with Head Start, and on-site technical assistance to pre-K educators. As a means of ensuring program quality, the MDE monitors pre-K programs through ongoing district monitoring processes and through a **MBE MDE**-adopted effectiveness evaluation plan. The MDE also offers a comprehensive early learning observational screener in Early Learning Collaboratives and a statewide Kindergarten Readiness Assessment to public pre-K programs and all public Kindergarten students each year. Results from these assessments are used to identify students in need of support and to target professional development to educators.

## ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TO MIDDLE SCHOOL

### **3rd Grade Reading Summative Assessment**

Through legislation passed in 2013, Mississippi has placed a strong emphasis on students reading at grade level by the end of 3rd grade. To support schools addressing early literacy outcomes for all students and identifying students in need of intervention, the MDE provides all districts with a suite of diagnostic assessments and screeners for use in Kindergarten to 3rd grade. Through a broadly deployed series of professional development and through the support of literacy coaches placed in the schools that struggle most with 3rd grade reading proficiency, the MDE has strengthened the capacity of teachers across the state. In accordance with a technical amendment passed in 2016, students will be required to score above the two lowest levels on the state accountability assessment for 3rd grade reading beginning in the 2018-19 school term, an increase from the current requirement that students score above the lowest achievement level for promotion.

## HIGH SCHOOL TO POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

### **College and Career Pathways/Individualized Career and Academic Plan**

MDE, the Mississippi Community and Junior Colleges (CJCs) and Institutions for Higher Learning (IHL) coordinated efforts to align the MDE Career Clusters, the Mississippi CJC Career Pathways, and the IHL Academic Majors to ensure a seamless transition for secondary students to postsecondary institutions. Using the Mississippi Articulation and Transfer Tool (MATT), secondary students will be able to sort by career cluster to locate appropriate programs of study at CJCs and IHLs. Guided pathways are a strategic effort to ensure students finish in a timely manner and strengthen the *Finish in 4* Mississippi higher education initiative.

### **College Countdown Mississippi**

College Countdown Mississippi is the Mississippi partner of The American College Application Campaign (ACAC). The mission is to help Mississippi high school seniors gain access to college through assistance with completing college applications, submitting the FAFSA (Free Application for Federal Student Aid) and the state grant application, and celebrating their acceptance to college. MDE, the Mississippi Community College Board (MCCB), IHL, and the Get2College Centers partner to provide free professional development to high school principals, high school counselors, college admissions staff, and college financial aid staff. An important component of this framework is called “Summer Melt”. Summer Melt references the time between high school graduation and the beginning of college classes in the fall. During this time students often face many barriers which prevent them from attending college in the fall even though they

have completed the application, been accepted, and secured financial aid. Through partnerships with stakeholders, high school counselors identify possible barriers to completing enrollment and ensure a support system is in place during the summer to continue to guide students along the path to postsecondary education.

### **Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit and Advanced Placement Task Force**

The Mississippi Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit and Advanced Placement Task Force seeks to create a College and Career Access Pathways partnership between K12 districts, Mississippi Community and Junior Colleges, and the Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning. The goal of the partnership is to provide admission for qualified secondary students and seamless transfer of credits earned to college and career postsecondary institutions. The Task Force reviewed four core areas of the dual enrollment process: (1) course quality (2) transferability of credit, (3) access, (4) removal of financial barriers.

### **Reducing the Need for Postsecondary Remediation**

In an effort to ensure students are graduating college and career ready, MDE and the Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning (IHL) collaborate on ways to successfully prepare students for entry into credit bearing college courses. MDE implemented secondary courses designed specifically to prepare students for postsecondary credit bearing courses. The IHLs ensured uniform acceptance for these courses through IHL policy.

### **National Defense Cadet Corps**

JROTC has been a part of Mississippi education since 1936. As a unique program designed to develop the citizenship and leadership skills of secondary students, this program also provides instruction in history, civics, natural science, engineering, law, health, physical fitness, and STEM education. While the JROTC program is currently fully implemented to the extent possible in Mississippi, there is an option for school districts to set up National Defense Cadet Corps (NDCC) programs. NDCCs are the same as JROTCs except for funding. School districts fully fund NDCCs whereas JROTCs are heavily subsidized by the service they represent. JROTC is a fully accredited educational program.

## **SYSTEM-WIDE APPROACH**

### **Arts Integration**

Mississippi's Whole Schools ~~Initiative~~ is a comprehensive statewide arts education program that uses arts as a vehicle for promoting high-quality instruction and learning for students in all disciplines. This unique program goes far beyond “art for art’s sake” and applies the learning power of the arts across the entire curriculum. ~~The Mississippi~~ Whole Schools ~~Initiative~~ provides

statewide support to teachers on integrating the arts to provide learning opportunities to improve students' academic achievement through the integration of the arts into the core curriculum. The goal of this work is to increase students' and teachers' skill, knowledge, awareness, and experiences in all arts disciplines.

### **Computer Science for Mississippi**

Starting with the 2016-17 school year, the MDE began the initial roll-out of the Computer Science for Mississippi (CS4MS) pilot program in 38 school districts across the state. During the pilot's first year, 67 high school teachers from 50 high schools and 167 K-5 teachers from 106 elementary schools taught computer science content to their students. More than 200 teachers received training during summer 2016.

In 2018, the MDE adopted the Mississippi College- and Career-Readiness Standards for Computer Science. These K-12 standards cover the five concepts of computer science: computing systems, networks and the internet, data and analysis, algorithms and programming, and impacts of computing.

The Mississippi Computer Science and Cyber Education Act was passed in 2021, which implemented a phased approach to providing computer science education to all students. By the 2024-2025 school year, all students will have access to K-12 computer science instruction. The MDE provides training educators to support the implementation of these K-12 computer science courses.

Participating districts were chosen via an application process and have committed to a robust schedule of professional development, data gathering, and adequate technology and infrastructure to qualify for the CS4MS pilot. For elementary-age students, the computer science curriculum will include coding, digital literacy, keyboarding, and robotics. High school students will enroll in a comprehensive course called Exploring Computer Science (ECS).

During future years of the CS4MS pilot program, the MDE plans to add 6th-8th grade courses, as well as an expanded offering of high school courses. Ultimately, the goal of CS4MS is to have a continuous K-12 computer science pipeline in place for all Mississippi public schools by the year 2024.

### **Counselors**

High school counselors assist students and families in identifying career and academic goals through the ISSP, and provide guidance to students in selecting courses and activities to meet their career and academic goals. As part of a comprehensive high school counseling program, school counselors should ensure

students and families have access to information about and assistance in completing the following activities:

- State/district graduation requirements
- The College Preparatory Curriculum (CPC) for MS IHLs
- Testing requirements for college admission (ACT/SAT)
- Admissions to Mississippi IHLs and CJC
- Admissions to out-of-state colleges and universities
- The college application process
- Scholarship opportunities and applications
- Federal financial aid
- State financial aid

### **Equitable Access to Resources**

School libraries support rigorous personalized learning experiences supported by technology and ensure equitable access to resources for all students.

### **Family Guides for Student Success in English and Spanish**

Parents are their child's first teachers in life and know their child better than anyone else. Parents have valuable insights into their child's needs, strengths, abilities, and interests.

The collaboration of parents and educators is vital in guiding each child toward success. Created in both English and Spanish, the *Family Guide for Student Success* outlines what each child should learn at each grade level from pre-K through 8th grade – all in parent-friendly terms. The *Family Guide for Student Success* booklets represent what all students should know and be able to do at the end of each grade level. The achievement of the expectations will help children meet the assessment standards established by Mississippi. It is only through parents' support and active participation in their children's education that a partnership for success is formed for all children in Mississippi.

### **Juvenile Detention Center Collaborations with Special Education & General Education**

The MDE is committed to helping students detained in juvenile detention centers (JDCs) remain academically stable as they navigate through the state's legal system. Fifteen JDCs, located across the state, are sponsored by local school districts and provide educational programming to detained youths year-round. Each JDC education program is staffed by certified teachers who provide both general education and special education services. In addition to providing core academic subject areas, the juvenile detention center education programs provide character education and transition services including career and technical education.



### **Move to Learn Healthy Schools Program**

Move to Learn is based on the simple concept that student movement improves both student health and academic performance. Numerous scientific studies have confirmed that the more exercise a student gets, the better his or her grades are likely to be. In several studies conducted on Mississippi students, more fitness was associated with better behavior and less absenteeism. Move to Learn is designed to help teachers raise student fitness and, in turn, raise student achievement. Move to Learn includes a series of short exercise videos and lesson plans to be used across grade levels.

### **Safe and Healthy Students**

Academic achievement is the primary way to measure student success, but Mississippi's schools support a whole-child approach through their focus on ensuring students are safe and healthy. From the state to the districts to the schools, Mississippi promotes community and parent involvement in schools, cultivates community partnerships, and provides school-based mental health and counseling services. The MDE also promotes supportive school climates to reduce the use of exclusionary discipline and promotes supportive school discipline. The MDE works in a variety of methods with districts to address dropouts and work to engage students before they get to that point. The state also invests in implementing systems and practices to prevent bullying and harassment and in supporting re-entry programs and transition services for justice-involved youth. Implementing programs that support a healthy, active lifestyle through nutritional and physical education is another key method toward this goal, as well as helping students develop relationship building skills to help improve safety through the recognition and prevention of coercion, violence, or abuse.

### **Teacher Recruiting, Retention, and Development**

#### **Early Childhood Grant**

Through a grant from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the MDE **expanded** support for early childhood educators across the state. The grant **supported** teachers statewide in a variety of pre-K settings to implement developmentally appropriate practices in their classrooms. Major grant activities include professional **learning** and coaching support, pre-K program evaluation to ensure program quality and student progress, the implementation of developmental assessments for students, and assistance with increasing **families'** participation in their children's education. **These services were extended through additional grant funding offering districts opportunities for developing pre-K programming in under-served areas.**

### **IHL Collaboration**

**The MDE offers ongoing professional development opportunities to teacher education program faculty on many of the state's major initiatives and K-12**

academic standards. The MDE tracks faculty participation rates annually in the EPP Annual Report.

### **Exemplar Unit Grant**

A grant received from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation in 2016 has allowed the MDE to assemble a cadre of teachers from across the state to develop a set of exemplar unit plans across grade levels. The first lessons were released online in the spring of 2017, and training has been conducted to support implementation of these lessons. Additionally, a training component has been deployed to assist districts in hosting parent night sessions focused on academic expectations for students.

### **Math-Science Partnerships**

STEM Master Teacher Corps allows for the continuation of support to STEM teachers in the form of professional development to improve both student achievement and outcomes in the STEM subjects. This is developed through intense training for classroom teachers through enriched instructional support and intensive, high-quality professional development activities that focus on deepening teachers' content knowledge. This program year currently targets grades K-8 mathematics teachers in high-need schools. The term "high-need school" refers to a school meeting at least two of the following criteria:

- 40% of the students qualify for free or reduced lunch and/or Title I;
- 40% of the students are low-performing on statewide assessments in the area of mathematics; and/or
- 10% of teachers are not teaching in the academic subjects that they were trained to teach.

Consequently, the MDE STEM Master Teacher Corps will expand professional development to be inclusive of K-12 STEM teachers in all STEM subjects.

### **On-Demand Professional Development**

In an effort to provide more direct support to districts and schools, the MDE, through the Office of Professional Development developed an on-demand professional development delivery model. Through a partnership with the University of Mississippi, the MDE has hired professional development coordinators to deliver on-demand training in the areas of language arts, literacy, mathematics, science, and special education. Training is provided through this model on content-specific topics as requested by schools or districts, at no local cost.

## **2. AWARDING SUBGRANTS (ESEA section 4103(c)(2)(B))**

Describe how the SEA will ensure that awards made to LEAs under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 are in amounts that are consistent with ESEA section 4105(a)(2).

The MDE will adhere to the statutory requirements for allocating funds. Allocations will be based on a formula to ensure that all LEAs receive at a minimum \$10,000. In the event the Congressional Appropriation is not sufficient to ensure the minimum requirement, allocations to LEAs will be ratably reduced.



## TITLE IV, PART B

### 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers

*NOTE: Section G relates to MBE Strategic Plan Goals 1, 2, 3, and 6.*

#### 1. USE OF FUNDS (ESEA section 4203(a)(2))

Describe how the SEA will use funds received under the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers program, including funds reserved for State-level activities.

The MDE's Title IV, Part B, 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) Program provides opportunities for communities to establish or expand activities in community learning centers that provide academic enrichment opportunities for children, particularly for students who attend high-poverty and low-performing schools, to meet state and local student standards in core academic subjects; offer students a broad array of enrichment activities that can complement their regular academic programs; and offer literacy and other educational services to the families of participating children.

Title IV, Part B funds will be used to support the goals of the MBE. Strategies include expanding STEM pathways in quality afterschool programming, collaborating with public/private partnerships involved with early childhood education, and collaborating with community organizations to engage families in comprehensive and improvement support schools. Activities may include math, science, and technology educational enrichment opportunities, family literacy programs, and character education programs.

The MDE intends to use funds to pay state-level MDE staff and contract workers to support the implementation of high-quality 21st CCLC programs. This includes monitoring, capacity-building, training, and technical assistance to ensure grantees align their activities with the challenging state academic standards and conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of programs and activities.

#### 2. AWARDING SUBGRANTS (ESEA section 4203(a)(4))

Describe the procedures and criteria the SEA will use for reviewing applications and awarding 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers funds to eligible entities on a competitive basis, which shall include procedures and criteria that take into consideration the likelihood that a proposed community learning center will help participating students meet the challenging State academic standards and any local academic standards.

As described in the vision, mission, and goals set forth by the MBE, the MDE is dedicated to student success including the improvement of student achievement to produce citizens who are capable of making complex decisions, solving complex problems, and communicating fluently in a global society. MDE currently has academic standards that outline the knowledge and skills students should have

within their K-12 education so that they will graduate from high school fully prepared for college and careers. The standards are:

- Aligned with college and work expectations;
- Clear, understandable, and consistent;
- Include rigorous content and application of knowledge through higher-order skills;
- Evidence- and research-based; and
- Prepare students to succeed in our global economy and society.

The standards are designed to be robust and relevant to the real world, reflecting the knowledge and skills that students need for success in college and careers. With Mississippi students fully prepared for the future, our communities will be best positioned to compete successfully in the global economy. The MDE requires that applicants indicate how the Mississippi College- and Career-Readiness Standards and the MBE goals will be incorporated in their 21st CCLC programs.

## **PROCESS FOR AWARDING GRANTS**

### **Requests for Proposals**

The MDE awards funds, through a competitive process, to proposals that will assist students in meeting or exceeding challenging state and local standards in academic subjects and provide significant expanded learning opportunities for students. Interested entities are required to submit applications to the MDE along with assurances and a preliminary plan for sustainable funding to ensure continuation of the project after the MDE funding ends.

The MDE's process for awarding competitive sub-grants to eligible schools, LEAs, organizations, and agencies is consistent for all grant competitions. All potential applicants are given the opportunity to attend regional technical assistance workshops designed to clarify grant requirements and the RFP process. Applications/RFPs, grant guidance, regulations, and legislation are disseminated at regional workshops. The MDE 21st CCLC program contact names, phone numbers, and e-mail addresses are provided for all interested applicants. RFP and contact information are also posted to the web site and in the academic education newsletter, as well as announcements made at workshops, conferences, newspapers, and other media venues. The methodology for the 21st CCLC program is approved by the MBE prior to approval of grant awards.

### **Continuation Awards**

The 21st CCLC Program staff will review continuation plans and use annual data to determine if subgrantees are eligible for continuation funding. Subgrantees will submit a continuation plan along with required documentation as

determined by the MDE. For a current subgrantee to be considered for continuation funding, all requirements listed below must be completed:

- A. **Monitoring**—Annual continuation funds for subsequent years of the award term are contingent upon a subgrantee receiving a satisfactory annual program monitoring report (no open findings). All findings and corrective actions must be successfully resolved and implemented on or before the MDE-designated date.
- B. **Program Performance Indicators**—A description of each subgrantee’s 21st CCLC goals and objectives are included in each approved application. Each subgrantee is required to complete and submit the 21st CCLC summative evaluation report to the MDE by the MDE-designated date.
- C. **Annual Performance Reporting Period**—Annual performance data must be accurate and fully up-to-date according to the MDE timelines, including completion of demographics, activities data, student progress, attendance, and program operation information. Subgrantees must also input data into the 21APR system according to timelines determined by the MDE in alignment with US Department of Education (ED) reporting deadlines.
- D. **Financial Compliance**—Subgrantee must be in compliance with all budgetary, accounting, and audit procedures and deadlines.

## GRANT TERMINATION PROCESS

### **Reduction or Termination/Reduction of Grant Award**

Failure to be in compliance with any assurances or aspect of the subgrant award may result in the delay, reduction, or termination of funds. The termination of a subgrant award may be initiated by the subgrantee or the MDE:

- A. The subgrantee may terminate the grant award at any time upon mutual agreement of MDE.
- B. The MDE, by written notice, may terminate the grant award if the Federal funds supporting the grant are reduced or withdrawn by the ED.
- C. The MDE, by written notice, may terminate or reduce the grant award for nonperformance by the subgrantee at any time during the term of the award. Examples of nonperformance include, but are not limited to, the failure to:
  - a. Provide a high-quality program with evidence of substantial progress;
  - b. Implement the program with fidelity as described in the subgrantee’s application;
  - c. Serve the targeted number of students on a daily basis;
  - d. Adhere to the signed assurances;

- e. Submit required reports and documentation according to MDE's timeline;
- f. Implement a corrective action plan;
- g. Resolve an audit finding; and
- h. Follow all requirements and guidelines as imposed by the ED or the MDE 21st CCLC program.

## **GRANT AWARD FUNDING**

The MDE ensures that applications for funding are of the highest possible quality and are tailored to meet the needs of students and their families. Quality is also measured through monitoring and ongoing technical assistance. Award amounts are (1) of sufficient size and scope to support high-quality, effective programs and (2) made in amounts of at least \$50,000.

All grants are awarded for a period of three to five years contingent upon appropriate implementation of the proposed project, fiscal responsibility, and completion and submission of all required documentation: Continuation Plan, Year - End Performance Report, 21APR Data Submission, and Satisfactory Monitoring Report as required and outlined in the RFP. This information is used to determine whether Subgrantees are making substantial progress toward meeting the objectives set forth in the original approved application. Funding to eligible organizations is subject to State Board of Education approval. The Mississippi Department of Education reserves the right to negotiate grant award amounts with all Subgrantees.

While the MDE anticipates awarding all applications that are reviewed and recommended by the Peer Review Committee to be funded, it is important to note that grant funding is contingent upon the availability of federal funds. The MDE reserves the right to conduct an additional competition during the year, if necessary, to ensure that all funds are awarded. Grant periods generally begin on August 1 of each year and end July 31 of the following year. Due to the timing of the release of subsequent RFPs, grant period beginning dates may vary; however, the time period of the award (12 months) will not change. 21st CCLC programs must become operational within 30 days of receiving the MDE award notification or within eight weeks from the first day of school, whichever is later. The MDE reserves the right to award an amount less than requested by the Subgrantee, contingent upon funding and the MDE's analysis of the need for the requested amount.

## **PEER REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Peer Reviewer Criteria and Selection**

The MDE requires all Peer Reviewers be selected to ensure that only qualified

contract workers participate in the review process. Reviewers are then selected, pending approval by the Office of Procurement, based on experience and knowledge of 21st CCLC, school improvement, out-of-school programming, youth development, federal grants designed for low-income and low-performing schools, mentoring, and Pre-K through 12th grade education. Additionally, reviewers are selected with regard to racial and gender diversity. Prior to the review of RFPs, the 21st CCLC Program staff provide training that includes an overview of 21st CCLC guidance, proposal criteria, and scoring rubric.

### **RFP Review**

Internal control mechanisms are in place to ensure that the competitiveness and integrity of the grant award process are followed. Members of the Office of Procurement provide monitoring and oversight of the awards process from the beginning to the end. The first point of submission of RFPs is through the Office of Procurement. From that point, staff from the Office of Procurement are involved in each stage of the awards process.

Upon receipt of the grant proposals, the 21st CCLC Program staff verifies that minimum requirements are met. The grant proposals are reviewed and scored by a Peer Review Committee comprised of specialists from public and private schools, business and community organizations, and other external agencies. The Peer Review Committee utilizes a scoring rubric to rate each of the grant proposals. Only proposals that meet the cut score established by the 21st CCLC Program office are eligible for funding.

Once the Peer Review team scores the RFPs and the Office of Procurement approves the recommendations for funding, the proposals are then submitted for State Board of Education approval. Once approval is received, applicants are sent a letter notifying them of the award. At this point, each grant recipient enters into a contract with the MDE and is provided additional information regarding grant requirements. Performance reports are due to the MDE annually to ensure compliance and to monitor the progress and achievement of students served by the grant. Numerous technical assistance and training sessions are offered to all grant recipients by the MDE, the site support contact, and the 21st CCLC Program staff.

## **TECHNICAL REVIEW PLAN**

The MDE awards subgrants only to applicants primarily serving students who attend low-performing schools with a high concentration of low-income students and families. Competitive priority points will be awarded to applicants who meet very specific criteria. The competitive priority points will be added only after the proposal has met the minimum quality cut score established by the 21st CCLC Program office.

In the unlikely event, there are two or more programs with identical combined scores (quality, priority points, and interview) the applicant with the higher quality score



will be ranked higher. If a tie exists at this point, the applicant with the highest “Program Plan” score will be ranked higher.

### **SELECTION CRITERIA**

Evaluation of proposals will be based upon the following criteria: needs assessment, budget, program plan for implementation, and evaluation plan for the proposed activities.



## TITLE V, PART B, SUBPART 2

### Rural and Low-Income School Program

*NOTE: Section H relates to MBE Strategic Plan Goals 1 and 2.*

#### 1. OUTCOMES AND OBJECTIVES (ESEA section 5223(b)(1))

Provide information on program objectives and outcomes for activities under Title V, Part B, Subpart 2, including how the SEA will use funds to help all students meet the challenging State academic standards.

The Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) Program is designed to address the unique needs of rural school districts by supporting a broad array of local activities to support student achievement. LEAs that are eligible to receive funding under the RLIS program are expected to set project goals that align with Mississippi's accountability system indicators. In applying for funds, LEAs must:

1. Describe in detail the need for the project, the goals and objectives relating to increased student academic achievement, decreased student dropout rates, or other factors the LEA may choose to measure;
2. Provide a summary of both the comprehensive needs assessment and the academic achievement on state assessments;
3. List the ESEA goal(s) and indicator(s) the LEA will implement and describe the activities that the LEA will use to meet the goal(s) and indicator(s). The MDE will measure the program's effectiveness based on the LEA's ability to meet the identified goals and objectives per the identified timeline. The MDE will provide program guidance through all available means to support LEAs to ensure RLIS funds are used as intended and are aligned with prioritized needs and goals of eligible LEAs.

#### 2. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (ESEA section 5223(b)(3))

Describe how the SEA will provide technical assistance to eligible LEAs to help such agencies implement the activities described in ESEA section 5222.

The SEA's Rural and Low-Income Schools (RLIS) coordinator will offer technical assistance to eligible LEAs as a direct contact for programmatic and fiscal guidance on the use of funds and activities in other programs for RLIS. The SEA provides a Title V webpage containing current resources and updates to the program. Finally, each LEA has an assigned SEA point of contact tasked with the responsibility of providing support across ESSA programs.



## EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM, MCKINNEY-VENTO HOMELESS ASSISTANCE ACT, TITLE VII, SUBTITLE B

*NOTE: Section I relates to MBE Strategic Plan Goals 1 and 2.*

### 1. **STUDENT IDENTIFICATION** (722(g)(1)(B) of the McKinney-Vento Act)

Describe the procedures the SEA will use to identify homeless children and youth in the State and to assess their needs.

The MDE works to support districts, particularly district homeless liaisons, in their understanding of the McKinney-Vento definition of homelessness. This support is provided through webinars and professional development sessions, as well as through resources available on the MDE website. Additionally, technical assistance is available to school districts concerned that they might be over or under-identifying students as homeless. In this technical assistance and in all McKinney-Vento-related activities, the definition of homelessness outlined in ESSA is used. The needs of homeless students are assessed during the review of data provided by school districts and reported to the U.S. Department of Education, including information on specific barriers to success and the appropriate services provided. Additionally, the MDE analyzes and evaluates homeless subgroup academic performance data to determine how effectively students who are homeless are being educated.

Every LEA must designate a McKinney-Vento liaison. In addition, each school must have a contact who has been trained on the McKinney-Vento Act. Homeless students are identified at the local level and marked as such in MSIS. MSIS also captures and generates a monthly report that highlights the services the homeless students receive, their living conditions, and any barriers to educational success. The data will be reviewed and monitored annually to identify common barriers, required services, and commonly occurring living conditions.

The MDE will further assist LEAs and families through the following activities:

- Disseminate posters and other resources to promote awareness (such as welcome packets and NCHE's Homeless Education Liaison Toolkit)
- Update and maintain a state webpage accessible for families and youth experiencing homelessness (post parent guides and other resources to inform homeless families of their educational rights)
- Host a homeless conference to provide an opportunity for collaboration between the state agency, LEAs, and agencies that service the homeless population (Federal Programs State Conference)

- Develop training modules for districts to use for local training of school personnel on the identification and support of homeless children and youth
- Share data and guidance on state website and update regularly
- Establish an advisory council comprised of multiagency personnel who work with homeless children and youth, such as school district homeless liaisons, public and private child welfare and social service providers, law enforcement, juvenile and family courts, mental health providers, child care providers, educators, etc. from across the state that will assist in the development and revision of policies, procedures, and resources; facilitate local and interagency collaboration
- Host quarterly conference calls or webinars for networking and collaboration among district-level homeless liaisons
- Monitor LEA plans to meet the needs of homeless children and youth.

## **2. DISPUTE RESOLUTION** *(722(g)(1)(C) of the McKinney-Vento Act)*

Describe procedures for the prompt resolution of disputes regarding the educational placement of homeless children and youth.

Mississippi's McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Dispute Resolution Procedure outlines the required process for addressing disputes about where the student should be enrolled in school. Under the policy, if an LEA makes a determination regarding school selection or enrollment that would result in the child or youth attending a school other than the one requested by the parent, guardian, or unaccompanied youth, a written explanation shall be provided in a manner and form understandable to the parent, guardian, or unaccompanied youth. The complainant shall be informed of the right to appeal and the written decision shall include a statement of the right to appeal to the LEA superintendent.

The dispute resolution process shall be initiated at the local level by the parent/guardian or unaccompanied youth who wishes to appeal the school district's decision. Every effort shall be made to resolve the complaint or dispute at the local level before it is brought to MDE. LEAs shall develop written policies and procedures with timelines that govern the dispute resolution process and shall include, at a minimum, the following:

If the parent, guardian, or unaccompanied youth disagrees with the LEA's decision and wishes to appeal to the LEA superintendent or his/her designee, the parent, guardian, or unaccompanied youth shall file a request for dispute resolution with the LEA liaison by completing a dispute resolution form or submitting a written request after receiving notification of the LEA's decision. The LEA superintendent's designee shall be someone other than the LEA liaison. The parent, guardian, or unaccompanied youth shall be informed of the right to appeal, and the LEA

superintendent's written decision shall include a statement of the right to appeal to the local school board of education.

If the parent, guardian, or unaccompanied youth disagrees with the LEA superintendent's decision and wishes to appeal to the local board of education, the parent, guardian, or unaccompanied youth shall inform the LEA liaison of the intent to appeal. The LEA liaison shall ensure an appointment is made for the next, regularly scheduled board meeting to address the dispute. The LEA liaison shall also provide the parent, guardian, or unaccompanied youth with the documentation collected up to that point, including the parent, guardian or unaccompanied youth's request for dispute resolution, the LEA liaison's and local superintendent's written decisions, and any other additional information submitted by the parent, guardian, or unaccompanied youth. The parent, guardian, or unaccompanied youth shall be informed of the right to appeal and the local school board's written decision shall include a statement of the right to appeal to the MDE if aggrieved.

Appeals made to the MDE shall be submitted in writing, signed by the complainant, and forwarded by the LEA. When a dispute reaches the MDE, the State Homeless Coordinator will gather needed information from statements of the parties involved and forward the information to the Executive Director of the Office of Federal Programs, along with a recommendation for resolution or further investigation. Within ten business days after receiving a complaint, the Executive Director of the Office of Federal Programs will recommend a resolution and will inform interested parties, in writing, of the decision.

If the parent, guardian, or unaccompanied youth disagrees with the decision, that party may, within ten business days, appeal to the State Superintendent. This appeal shall be made in writing and state why the party disagrees with the decision of the Executive Director of the Office of Federal Programs. Within ten business days after receiving an appeal, the State Superintendent or his/her designee will render a final administrative decision and notify all parties in writing.

Local dispute resolution policies are expected to at a minimum reflect the timelines and expectations of the state dispute resolution policy. LEAs can, however, implement shorter resolution timelines than those outlined in the state policy when the dispute is at the local level. LEA dispute resolution policies will be reviewed during monitoring. While the dispute is being resolved, the child or children in question must be enrolled in school and receive all services for which they are eligible, including transportation services. If the dispute is concerning the school of "best interest," the child must be enrolled in the school preferred by the parent/guardian or unaccompanied youth.

### **3. SUPPORT FOR SCHOOL PERSONNEL** *(722(g)(1)(D) of the McKinney-Vento Act)*

Describe programs for school personnel (including the LEA liaisons for homeless children and youth, principals and other school leaders, attendance officers, teachers, enrollment personnel, and specialized instructional support personnel) to heighten the awareness of such school personnel of the specific needs of homeless children and youth, including runaway and homeless children and youth.

The MDE will provide assistance for school personnel via the following activities:

- Facilitate both online and face-to-face trainings on homeless education for LEA liaisons for runaway and homeless children and youth, principals and other school-level leaders, attendance officers, teachers, enrollment personnel, and specialized instructional support personnel to heighten the awareness of such school personnel of the identification of and specific needs of runaway and homeless children and youth. Trainings will focus on requirements of McKinney-Vento and the removal of potential academic barriers for homeless children and youth. Resources for identifying and serving homeless children will be provided to LEAs.
- Collaborate with LEAs to implement a week-long, statewide campaign to bring awareness to student homelessness.
- Facilitate training sessions on homeless education during statewide educational events to provide guidance on best practices, allowable costs, and blending and braiding of funds (such as superintendents' meetings, conferences hosted by other MDE offices, etc.)
- Provide training resources (online training modules, toolkits, posters, etc.) and post on the state website to assist with local training of district personnel, such as educators, cafeteria workers, and bus drivers
- Provide technical assistance to LEAs on the local implementation of the McKinney-Vento Act, spending, and other requested topics
- Encourage districts to develop local advisory councils for collaboration on their specific local needs and resources

An annual meeting of the state's homeless liaisons will be held. Topics will be identified through the monitoring process, review of LEA plans, and the SEA Needs Assessment. A survey also will be conducted to assess LEA needs. Sign-in sheets will be used to document participation of face-to-face events and login documentation will be used to monitor participation in make-up trainings conducted via webinar. Participation in the training will be reviewed at the time of LEA monitoring, and monitoring also will ensure that school counselors, as well as all staff involved in the registration process, have received training on the identification of and removal of academic barriers to students who are homeless. Additionally, more targeted online and face-to-face technical assistance will be provided to LEAs that are in the top quartile of poverty rates, but have low percentages of identified homeless students.

#### 4. ACCESS TO SERVICES (722(g)(1)(F) of the McKinney-Vento Act)

Describe procedures that ensure that:

- i. Homeless children have access to public preschool programs, administered by the SEA or LEA, as provided to other children in the State;
- ii. Homeless youth and youth separated from public schools are identified and accorded equal access to appropriate secondary education and support services, including by identifying and removing barriers that prevent youth described in this clause from receiving appropriate credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending a prior school, in accordance with State, local, and school policies; and
- iii. Homeless children and youth who meet the relevant eligibility criteria do not face barriers to accessing academic and extracurricular activities, including magnet school, summer school, career and technical education, advanced placement, online learning, and charter school programs, if such programs are available at the State and local levels.

The MDE will ensure the following support to LEAs:

- Ensure LEAs use enrollment and withdrawal forms to inquire about living situations and siblings of school-aged children (including homeless youth separated from public school) or ensure they develop procedures within each LEA
- Provide early childhood staff in LEAs with information on the enrollment of, identification of, and needs of homeless students, as well as how to remove potential barriers
- Support intra-agency collaboration and training of MDE office staff to ensure identification of homeless children and youth, including homeless youth separated from public school, for early identification and support
- Encourage districts to use available funds to establish pre-K programs and to prioritize the enrollment of homeless students
- Encourage collaboration between the SEA, LEAs, and Head Start programs
- Encourage collaboration between homeless shelters and other organizations that potentially serve homeless children separated from public school
- Encourage the consistent prioritization of homeless children and youth during the enrollment process and participation in extracurricular activities, extracurricular and nutrition programs, and LEA-offered pre-K programs
- Ensure LEAs develop procedures to award credit to homeless youths who satisfactorily completed full or partial coursework at a prior school, as part of the immediate enrollment process and to transmit that information to future schools
- Strengthen communication regarding partial credit options, credit recovery opportunities, and other opportunities that could serve as

pathways to graduation for homeless youth separated from public school

- Ensure LEAs develop alternate application procedures which will allow homeless students, including homeless youth separated from public school, the opportunity to immediately enroll in magnet and charter schools, AP courses, CTE, etc.
- Ensure LEAs develop procedures to award credit to homeless youth, including youth previously separated from public school, who satisfactorily completed full or partial coursework at a prior school as part of the immediate enrollment process and to transmit that information to future schools
- Ensure LEAs develop alternate application procedures which will allow homeless students the opportunity to immediately enroll in magnet and charter schools, AP courses, CTE programs, etc.

Regarding services provided to homeless youth and youth separated from public schools, LEAs are instructed not to allow outstanding fines or school attendance issues to create barriers to being enrolled in school or participating fully in school activities, including graduation. Enrollment and fine practices will be monitored to ensure these policies are followed. Policies will be reviewed by MDE to ensure appropriate policies are implemented and followed. Additionally, sample draft policies will be provided by MDE and placed on the agency's McKinney-Vento webpage.

To help ensure that homeless youth, including youth separated from public school, receive appropriate credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending a prior school, the MDE maintains a list of approved K-12 course codes and course names through MSIS. Furthermore, the Office of Federal Programs works collaboratively with LEAs to develop local policies to support children and youth experiencing homelessness and ensure they face no barriers that prevent them from receiving appropriate credit for coursework completed while attending a previous school. Options for homeless youth and youth separated from public school might include credit recovery, online courses, and working across LEAs to give opportunities to receive credit for completed coursework. The State Homeless Coordinator or a designee will ensure LEAs are in compliance with this provision of the law during monitoring. LEAs found to be out of compliance will receive technical assistance and potentially face corrective action. Additionally, alternate application processes will be reviewed during monitoring and sample draft policies will be provided by MDE and placed on the agency's McKinney-Vento webpage. LEAs, in collaboration with their local counselors, will be expected to monitor and evaluate the data on homeless participation rates annually. Programs to be included, as applicable,



are magnet school, summer school, career and technical education, AP, online learning, charter schools, and extracurricular activities.

**5. STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS OTHER PROBLEMS** *(722(g)(1)(H) of the McKinney-Vento Act)*

Provide strategies to address other problems with respect to the education of homeless children and youth, including problems resulting from enrollment delays that are caused by—

- i. requirements of immunization and other required health records;
- ii. residency requirements;
- iii. lack of birth certificates, school records, or other documentation;
- iv. guardianship issues; or
- v. uniform or dress code requirements.

In the area of professional development, district homeless liaisons, as well as many counselors, administrators, teachers and other educators, receive information on the identification of homeless students, as well as on the most common needs of homeless students and how to address those specific needs. Training and technical assistance are provided to help ensure all barriers to the enrollment and retention of homeless children and youth are removed. The training and technical assistance will review requirements of ESSA and requirements for removal of barriers that include immunization requirements, residency requirements, lack of birth certificates, school records, or other documentation, guardianship issues, or uniform dress code requirements. Mississippi educators have the opportunity to learn key principles of trauma-informed care, and how educators can work to address the needs of students who have experienced trauma in childhood. Additionally, educators who work with students who are homeless are provided with information on key principles of cultural competency, including how to meet the needs of migrant, immigrant, and EL students.

The MDE encourages collaboration with local, community-based organizations and religious and civic organizations to provide support to homeless children and families.

Homeless liaisons collaborate with the Mississippi Department of Health to secure immunization and other required health records through a secure online management system. LEAs are required to submit an Immunization Compliance Report by each year in December.

The MDE employs school attendance officers across the state who collaborate with school district personnel and are responsible for enforcing the Mississippi Compulsory School Attendance Law. These officers assist in the following:

- Identification of all compulsory-school-age children who are not attending school

- Provide appropriate counseling to encourage all school-age children to attend school until they have completed high school
- Attempt to secure the provision of social or welfare services that may be required to enable any child to attend school
- Collect and maintain information concerning absenteeism, dropouts and other attendance related problems
- Collaborate with and support the district homeless liaison
- Verify residency

These school attendance officers will also be trained annually on the McKinney-Vento Act.

As an enrollment requirement, any transfer student from a school or program not accredited regionally or by a state board of education is given either a standardized achievement test(s) or teacher-made special subject tests(s) to determine the appropriate classification of the student within thirty (30) days after filing for transfer. This may include students who are homeless with no prior academic records.

If a student is experiencing homelessness and is not in the physical custody of a parent or guardian, school district personnel utilize alternate documents, such as caretaker forms or affidavits.

In addition to using federal funds, school districts are encouraged to seek in-kind donations and collaborate with local businesses and organizations to support students who are homeless by providing uniforms or meeting other needs.

#### **6. POLICIES TO REMOVE BARRIERS** *(722(g)(1)(I) of the McKinney-Vento Act)*

Demonstrate that the SEA and LEAs in the State have developed, and shall review and revise, policies to remove barriers to the identification of homeless children and youth, and the enrollment and retention of homeless children and youth in schools in the State, including barriers to enrollment and retention due to outstanding fees or fines, or absences.

Both the State and LEAs have developed policies, which they will review and revise, to remove barriers to the identification of homeless children and youth, including homeless children and youth who have been separated from public schools. Both State and local policies must be reviewed and revised to reflect changes to the McKinney-Vento Act under ESSA and to ensure that any newly identified barriers to the success of homeless students are addressed. MDE will provide draft policies designed to ensure all barriers to the enrollment and retention of children and youth in homeless situations are removed and that policies reflect the changes of ESSA. LEAs should develop and revise their own policies, using draft policies as guides.

Through the monitoring process, the Office of Federal Programs will review local educational agency homeless education policies to ensure all barriers to the enrollment and retention of homeless children and youth are removed, including barriers to enrollment and retention of homeless children and youth due to outstanding fees, fines or absences. Districts have been provided with a webinar outlining changes to policy related to ESSA, and are required to update their district policies accordingly. Homeless students and families must be provided a written statement of their rights when they enroll and at least two times per year. Districts are required to have a dispute resolution process, and the state also has a process for students and families who are unable to resolve disputes at the local level.

## **7. ASSISTANCE FROM COUNSELORS** (722(g)(1)(K))

A description of how youths described in section 725(2) will receive assistance from counselors to advise such youths, and prepare and improve the readiness of such youths for college.

Counselors and district homeless liaisons will receive technical assistance outlining how to remove barriers homeless students often face when attempting to enroll in college, including supports for how to fill out FAFSA as unaccompanied minors. Additionally, schools and districts will be required to analyze the academic achievement data of students who are homeless, and to provide intervention services to homeless students.

All McKinney-Vento youth will receive individualized counseling from school counselors to prepare for and improve readiness for college, including college selection, application and supports available during the application process, financial aid and other on-campus supports. School districts will be required to maintain records documenting that McKinney-Vento youths have received this counseling. Districts also must verify that all unaccompanied youth were informed of their status as independent students and have obtained verification of that status. Districts unable to provide this documentation will receive technical assistance from MDE. This assistance will be targeted toward putting key student supports in place, revising policies and otherwise working to remove academic barriers for homeless youth. Districts that continue to have monitoring findings in this area will face corrective action.

Technical assistance will be provided to help counselors better understand how to identify and serve students who are homeless. Webinars will focus on how counselors can support students in the removal of potential academic barriers, including enrollment, credit accrual, and completion of the FAFSA to attend college.

## APPENDIX A

### Measurements of Interim Progress

*Instructions: Each SEA must include the measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for academic achievement, graduation rates, and English language proficiency, set forth in the State’s response to Title I, Part A question 4.iii, for all students and separately for each subgroup of students, including those listed in response to question 4.i.a. of this document. For academic achievement and graduation rates, the State’s measurements of interim progress must take into account the improvement necessary on such measures to make significant progress in closing statewide proficiency and graduation rate gaps.*

#### A. Academic Achievement

##### Baseline, Measures of Interim Progress, and Long-term Goals for Student Proficiency in Reading/Language Arts

STUDENT PROFICIENCY IN READING/LANGUAGE ARTS				
SUBGROUPS	BASELINE DATA	INTERIM MEASURE	INTERIM MEASURE	LONG-TERM GOAL
	2015-16	2018-19	2021-22	<del>2024-25</del> 2026-27
All students	32.6%	45.1%	57.5%	70.0%
Economically disadvantaged students	24.4%	39.6%	54.8%	70.0%
Students with disabilities	8.9%	29.3%	49.6%	70.0%
English learners	13.6%	32.4%	51.2%	70.0%
Alaskan Native or Native American	28.0%	42.0%	56.0%	70.0%
Asian	57.7%	61.8%	65.9%	70.0%
Black or African American	18.9%	35.9%	53.0%	70.0%
Hispanic/Latino	28.4%	42.2%	56.1%	70.0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	48.9%	55.9%	63.0%	70.0%
White	47.5%	55.0%	62.5%	70.0%
Two or More Races	37.3%	48.2%	59.1%	70.0%

**Baseline, Measures of Interim Progress, and Long-term Goals for Student Proficiency in Mathematics**

<b>STUDENT PROFICIENCY IN MATHEMATICS</b>				
<b>SUBGROUPS</b>	<b>BASELINE DATA</b>	<b>INTERIM MEASURE</b>	<b>INTERIM MEASURE</b>	<b>LONG-TERM GOAL</b>
	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<del>2024-25</del> <b>2026-27</b>
All students	31.1%	44.1%	57.0%	70.0%
Economically disadvantaged students	23.1%	38.7%	54.4%	70.0%
Students with disabilities	9.1%	29.4%	49.7%	70.0%
English learners	22.9%	38.6%	54.3%	70.0%
Alaskan Native or Native American	26.2%	40.8%	55.4%	70.0%
Asian	68.3%	68.9%	69.4%	70.0%
Black or African American	17.4%	35.0%	52.5%	70.0%
Hispanic/Latino	32.9%	45.3%	57.6%	70.0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	48.1%	55.4%	62.7%	70.0%
White	45.2%	53.5%	61.7%	70.0%
Two or More Races	36.2%	47.5%	58.7%	70.0%

**Baseline and Long-term Goals for Student Proficiency by Grade (for Informational Purposes Only)**

<b>3RD GRADE</b>				
<b>BASELINE AND LONG-TERM GOALS FOR STUDENT PROFICIENCY</b>				
<b>SUBGROUPS</b>	<b>READING/LANGUAGE ARTS</b>		<b>MATHEMATICS</b>	
	<b>BASELINE DATA</b>	<b>LONG-TERM GOAL</b>	<b>BASELINE DATA</b>	<b>LONG-TERM GOAL</b>
	<b>2015-16</b>	<del>2024-25</del> <b>2026-27</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<del>2024-25</del> <b>2026-27</b>
All students	32.1%	70.0%	32.8%	70.0%
Economically disadvantaged students	24.4%	70.0%	26.1%	70.0%
Students with disabilities	14.4%	70.0%	16.4%	70.0%
English learners	21.1%	70.0%	33.5%	70.0%
Alaskan Native or Native American	34.6%	70.0%	37.0%	70.0%
Asian	51.9%	70.0%	68.2%	70.0%
Black or African American	18.1%	70.0%	21.0%	70.0%
Hispanic/Latino	24.8%	70.0%	34.1%	70.0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	40.7%	70.0%	59.3%	70.0%
White	48.9%	70.0%	45.6%	70.0%
Two or More Races	39.1%	70.0%	39.8%	70.0%

\* For any subgroup with a baseline proficiency rate at or above 70%, it is expected that the subgroup exceeds their baseline rate each year.

<b>4TH GRADE</b>				
<b>BASELINE AND LONG-TERM GOALS FOR STUDENT PROFICIENCY</b>				
<b>SUBGROUPS</b>	<b>READING/LANGUAGE ARTS</b>		<b>MATHEMATICS</b>	
	<b>BASELINE DATA</b>	<b>LONG-TERM GOAL</b>	<b>BASELINE DATA</b>	<b>LONG-TERM GOAL</b>
	<b>2015-16</b>	<del>2024-25</del> <b>2026-27</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<del>2024-25</del> <b>2026-27</b>
All students	32.6%	70.0%	32.2%	70.0%
Economically disadvantaged students	25.0%	70.0%	24.6%	70.0%
Students with disabilities	12.8%	70.0%	13.2%	70.0%
English learners	18.8%	70.0%	28.6%	70.0%
Alaskan Native or Native American	25.8%	70.0%	22.6%	70.0%
Asian	50.1%	70.0%	62.4%	70.0%
Black or African American	19.6%	70.0%	18.8%	70.0%
Hispanic/Latino	28.0%	70.0%	33.8%	70.0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	45.5%	70.0%	54.6%	70.0%
White	46.2%	70.0%	45.4%	70.0%
Two or More Races	35.7%	70.0%	34.3%	70.0%

\* For any subgroup with a baseline proficiency rate at or above 70%, it is expected that the subgroup exceeds their baseline rate each year.

<b>5TH GRADE</b>				
<b>BASELINE AND LONG-TERM GOALS FOR STUDENT PROFICIENCY</b>				
<b>SUBGROUPS</b>	<b>READING/LANGUAGE ARTS</b>		<b>MATHEMATICS</b>	
	<b>BASELINE DATA</b>	<b>LONG-TERM GOAL</b>	<b>BASELINE DATA</b>	<b>LONG-TERM GOAL</b>
	<b>2015-16</b>	<del>2024-25</del> <b>2026-27</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<del>2024-25</del> <b>2026-27</b>
All students	34.2%	70.0%	30.0%	70.0%
Economically disadvantaged students	26.7%	70.0%	22.3%	70.0%
Students with disabilities	8.7%	70.0%	7.2%	70.0%
English learners	13.9%	70.0%	16.5%	70.0%
Alaskan Native or Native American	20.5%	70.0%	23.3%	70.0%
Asian	62.2%	70.0%	64.0%	70.0%
Black or African American	21.4%	70.0%	16.6%	70.0%
Hispanic/Latino	29.8%	70.0%	30.0%	70.0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	43.8%	70.0%	31.3%	70.0%
White	47.2%	70.0%	43.2%	70.0%
Two or More Races	36.9%	70.0%	32.0%	70.0%

\* For any subgroup with a baseline proficiency rate at or above 70%, it is expected that the subgroup exceeds their baseline rate each year.



<b>6TH GRADE</b>				
<b>BASELINE AND LONG-TERM GOALS FOR STUDENT PROFICIENCY</b>				
<b>SUBGROUPS</b>	<b>READING/LANGUAGE ARTS</b>		<b>MATHEMATICS</b>	
	<b>BASELINE DATA</b>	<b>LONG-TERM GOAL</b>	<b>BASELINE DATA</b>	<b>LONG-TERM GOAL</b>
	<b>2015-16</b>	<del>2024-25</del> <b>2026-27</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<del>2024-25</del> <b>2026-27</b>
All students	29.2%	70.0%	32.5%	70.0%
Economically disadvantaged students	21.2%	70.0%	24.4%	70.0%
Students with disabilities	6.1%	70.0%	7.2%	70.0%
English learners	6.5%	70.0%	16.6%	70.0%
Alaskan Native or Native American	22.7%	70.0%	30.9%	70.0%
Asian	55.8%	70.0%	70.3%	70.0%
Black or African American	16.0%	70.0%	18.6%	70.0%
Hispanic/Latino	24.7%	70.0%	32.1%	70.0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	53.8%	70.0%	53.9%	70.0%
White	42.4%	70.0%	46.0%	70.0%
Two or More Races	34.4%	70.0%	36.0%	70.0%

\* For any subgroup with a baseline proficiency rate at or above 70%, it is expected that the subgroup exceeds their baseline rate each year.

<b>7TH GRADE</b>				
<b>BASELINE AND LONG-TERM GOALS FOR STUDENT PROFICIENCY</b>				
<b>SUBGROUPS</b>	<b>READING/LANGUAGE ARTS</b>		<b>MATHEMATICS</b>	
	<b>BASELINE DATA</b>	<b>LONG-TERM GOAL</b>	<b>BASELINE DATA</b>	<b>LONG-TERM GOAL</b>
	<b>2015-16</b>	<del>2024-25</del> <b>2026-27</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<del>2024-25</del> <b>2026-27</b>
All students	29.1%	70.0%	34.2%	70.0%
Economically disadvantaged students	21.2%	70.0%	25.1%	70.0%
Students with disabilities	5.4%	70.0%	6.8%	70.0%
English learners	4.7%	70.0%	19.5%	70.0%
Alaskan Native or Native American	21.6%	70.0%	23.9%	70.0%
Asian	59.7%	70.0%	76.4%	70.0%
Black or African American	16.0%	70.0%	19.2%	70.0%
Hispanic/Latino	26.7%	70.0%	36.4%	70.0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	57.1%	70.0%	50.0%	70.0%
White	42.2%	70.0%	48.6%	70.0%
Two or More Races	32.2%	70.0%	41.7%	70.0%

\* For any subgroup with a baseline proficiency rate at or above 70%, it is expected that the subgroup exceeds their baseline rate each year.

<b>8TH GRADE</b>				
<b>BASELINE AND LONG-TERM GOALS FOR STUDENT PROFICIENCY</b>				
<b>SUBGROUPS</b>	<b>READING/LANGUAGE ARTS</b>		<b>MATHEMATICS</b>	
	<b>BASELINE DATA</b>	<b>LONG-TERM GOAL</b>	<b>BASELINE DATA</b>	<b>LONG-TERM GOAL</b>
	<b>2015-16</b>	<del>2024-25</del> <b>2026-27</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<del>2024-25</del> <b>2026-2027</b>
All students	33.3%	70.0%	30.9%	70.0%
Economically disadvantaged students	24.7%	70.0%	22.0%	70.0%
Students with disabilities	5.4%	70.0%	5.8%	70.0%
English learners	6.2%	70.0%	13.9%	70.0%
Alaskan Native or Native American	34.4%	70.0%	28.9%	70.0%
Asian	63.8%	70.0%	71.3%	70.0%
Black or African American	20.0%	70.0%	16.4%	70.0%
Hispanic/Latino	31.5%	70.0%	32.8%	70.0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	62.5%	70.0%	31.3%	70.0%
White	46.7%	70.0%	45.3%	70.0%
Two or More Races	41.8%	70.0%	35.4%	70.0%

\* For any subgroup with a baseline proficiency rate at or above 70%, it is expected that the subgroup exceeds their baseline rate each year.

<b>HIGH SCHOOL</b>				
<b>BASELINE AND LONG-TERM GOALS FOR STUDENT PROFICIENCY</b>				
<b>SUBGROUPS</b>	<b>READING/LANGUAGE ARTS</b>		<b>MATHEMATICS</b>	
	<b>BASELINE DATA</b>	<b>LONG-TERM GOAL</b>	<b>BASELINE DATA</b>	<b>LONG-TERM GOAL</b>
	<b>2015-16</b>	<del>2024-25</del> <b>2026-27</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<del>2024-25</del> <b>2026-27</b>
All students	37.2%	70.0%	26.1%	70.0%
Economically disadvantaged students	26.9%	70.0%	17.8%	70.0%
Students with disabilities	6.9%	70.0%	4.6%	70.0%
English learners	9.4%	70.0%	15.2%	70.0%
Alaskan Native or Native American	36.2%	70.0%	18.2%	70.0%
Asian	60.5%	70.0%	66.7%	70.0%
Black or African American	20.7%	70.0%	12.8%	70.0%
Hispanic/Latino	35.5%	70.0%	30.7%	70.0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	43.8%	70.0%	37.5%	70.0%
White	58.5%	70.0%	42.7%	70.0%
Two or More Races	44.3%	70.0%	33.3%	70.0%

\* For any subgroup with a baseline proficiency rate at or above 70%, it is expected that the subgroup exceeds their baseline rate each year.

## B. Graduation Rates

### Baseline, Measures of Interim Progress, and Long-term Goals for Graduation Rate

GRADUATION RATE				
SUBGROUPS	BASELINE DATA	INTERIM MEASURE	INTERIM MEASURE	LONG-TERM GOAL
	2015-16	2018-19	2021-22	<del>2024-25</del> 2026-27
All students	82.3%	84.8%	87.4%	90.0%
Economically disadvantaged students	78.8%	82.0%	85.3%	88.5%
Students with disabilities	34.7%	46.5%	58.2%	70.0%
English learners	55.9%	63.6%	71.2%	78.9%
Alaskan Native or Native American	87.5%	89.1%	90.6%	92.2%
Asian	92.6%	93.2%	93.8%	94.3%
Black or African American	78.9%	82.1%	85.4%	88.6%
Hispanic/Latino	81.8%	84.5%	87.2%	89.8%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	77.8%	81.2%	84.7%	88.1%
White	85.8%	87.7%	89.6%	91.5%
Two or More Races	78.2%	81.5%	84.9%	88.3%

## C. Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency

GROWTH TO ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY				
SUBGROUP	BASELINE DATA	INTERIM MEASURE	INTERIM MEASURE	LONG-TERM GOAL
	2015-16	2018-19	2021-22	<del>2024-25</del> 2026-27
English learners	48.3%	53.7%	61.9%	70.0%

## APPENDIX B

OMB Control No. 1894-0005 (Exp. 03/31/2017)

### NOTICE TO ALL APPLICANTS

The purpose of this enclosure is to inform you about a new provision in the Department of Education's General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) that applies to applicants for new grant awards under Department programs. This provision is Section 427 of GEPA, enacted as part of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (Public Law (P.L.) 103-382).

#### To Whom Does This Provision Apply?

Section 427 of GEPA affects applicants for new grant awards under this program. **ALL APPLICANTS FOR NEW AWARDS MUST INCLUDE INFORMATION IN THEIR APPLICATIONS TO ADDRESS THIS NEW PROVISION IN ORDER TO RECEIVE FUNDING UNDER THIS PROGRAM.**

(If this program is a State-formula grant program, a State needs to provide this description only for projects or activities that it carries out with funds reserved for State-level uses. In addition, local school districts or other eligible applicants that apply to the State for funding need to provide this description in their applications to the State for funding. The State would be responsible for ensuring that the school district or other local entity has submitted a sufficient section 427 statement as described below.)

#### What Does This Provision Require?

Section 427 requires each applicant for funds (other than an individual person) to include in its application a description of the steps the applicant proposes to take to ensure equitable access to, and participation in, its Federally-assisted program for students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries with special needs. This provision allows applicants discretion in developing the required description. The statute highlights six types of barriers that can impede equitable access or participation: gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age. Based on local circumstances, you should determine whether these or other barriers may prevent your students, teachers, etc. from such access or participation in, the Federally-funded project or activity. The description in your application of steps to be taken to overcome these barriers need not be lengthy; you may provide a clear and succinct description of how you plan to address those barriers that are applicable to your circumstances. In addition, the information may be provided in a single narrative,

or, if appropriate, may be discussed in connection with related topics in the application.

Section 427 is not intended to duplicate the requirements of civil rights statutes, but rather to ensure that, in designing their projects, applicants for Federal funds address equity concerns that may affect the ability of certain potential beneficiaries to fully participate in the project and to achieve to high standards. Consistent with program requirements and its approved application, an applicant may use the Federal funds awarded to it to eliminate barriers it identifies.

#### What are Examples of How an Applicant Might Satisfy the Requirement of This Provision?

The following examples may help illustrate how an applicant may comply with Section 427.

- (1) An applicant that proposes to carry out an adult literacy project serving, among others, adults with limited English proficiency, might describe in its application how it intends to distribute a brochure about the proposed project to such potential participants in their native language.
- (2) An applicant that proposes to develop instructional materials for classroom use might describe how it will make the materials available on audio tape or in braille for students who are blind.
- (3) An applicant that proposes to carry out a model science program for secondary students and is concerned that girls may be less likely than boys to enroll in the course, might indicate how it intends to conduct "outreach" efforts to girls, to encourage their enrollment.
- (4) An applicant that proposes a project to increase school safety might describe the special efforts it will take to address concern of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender students, and efforts to reach out to and involve the families of LGBT students

We recognize that many applicants may already be implementing effective steps to ensure equity of access and participation in their grant programs, and we appreciate your cooperation in responding to the requirements of this provision.

### Estimated Burden Statement for GEPA Requirements

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1.5 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain benefit (Public Law 103-382. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, MS400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email [ICDocketMgr@ed.gov](mailto:ICDocketMgr@ed.gov) and reference the OMB Control Number 1894-0005.

### Section 427 GEPA Statement

The MBE is responsible for Federal funds awarded to the State and administered under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as reauthorized by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The MBE requires each applicant for federal funds (other than an individual person) to describe the steps the applicant will take to ensure equitable access to and equitable participation in the activities to be conducted using such funds. Specifically, applicants must address the special needs of program beneficiaries (e.g., students and teachers) in order to overcome barriers to equitable participation, including "barriers based on gender, race, color, national origin, disability, and age."