FFY 2019 Indicator B-17/C-11 Annual Performance Report (APR) Optional Template

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). (Please limit your response to 785 characters).

The State will increase the percentage of third grade students with Specific Learning Disability and Language/Speech rulings in targeted districts who score proficient or higher on the regular statewide reading assessment to 24 percent by FFY 2018.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission?

No

If "Yes", provide an explanation for the change(s), including the role of stakeholders in decision-making. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Baseline Data: 16%

Has the SiMR target changed since the last SSIP submission? No

FFY 2018 Target: 24%   **FFY 2019 Target**: 24%

FFY 2018 Data: 25.1%   **FFY 2019 Data:**

Was the State's FFY 2019 Target Met? No

Did slippage¹ occur? No

If applicable, describe the reasons for slippage. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

---

¹ The definition of slippage: *A worsening from the previous data AND a failure to meet the target.* The worsening also needs to meet certain thresholds to be considered slippage:
   1.   For a "large" percentage (10% or above), it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 1.0 percentage point. For example:
      a.   It is not slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator X are 32% and the FFY 2018 data were 32.9%.
      b.   It is slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator X are 32% and the FFY 2018 data were 33.1%.
   2.   For a "small" percentage (less than 10%), it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 0.1 percentage point. For example:
      a.   It is not slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator Y are 5.1% and the FFY 2018 data were 5%.
      b.   It is slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator Y are 5.1% and the FFY 2018 data were 4.9%.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data *(i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey)* **that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR?**   Yes

If "Yes", describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.
(Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

Universal screening assessments were administered to all students and diagnostic assessments provided in-depth information about individual student's particular strengths and needs. Districts utilizing i-Ready or Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) reported 83.3% growth, and those utilizing Standardized Test for the Assessment of Reading (STAR), reported 25% growth. Four districts utilized i-Ready. i-Ready reports from those districts, projected a 71% increase in the number of SLD students and a 29% increase in the number of LS students scoring proficient or advanced on ELA Statewide assessments. Two districts utilized the NWEA. NWEA reports from those districts projected a 75% increase in the number of SLD students and 100% increase in the number of students scoring proficient or advanced on ELA Statewide assessments. Two districts utilized STAR. STAR reports from those districts projected a 33% increase in the number of SLD students and 0% increase in the number of LS students projected to score proficient or advanced on ELA Statewide assessments. Literacy Learning Walks were conducted in all SSIP elementary K-3 classrooms using a research-based protocol developed by the MDE Office of Elementary Education and Reading. All SSIP districts reported growth in aligning instruction to the standards, data analysis, and the five components of reading, 86% of districts reported growth in small group teacher led instruction and implementation of center instruction, 57%

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Did the State identify any data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period?   Yes   ▾

If "Yes", describe any data quality issues specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space).

SiMR data could not be collected due to circumstances caused by COVID and the suspension of federal and state assessments. Additional data collected that addressed progress towards the SiMR did present data quality concerns. Participating SSIP districts completed two surveys the SSIP Infrastructure Analysis and Literacy Instructional Capacity Survey for Teachers and the Teacher Knowledge of Early Literacy Skills (TKELS). Brainspring also conducted a survey. In some districts, the participation numbers were low, and some districts did not complete the surveys and/or test at all.
Only 47 teachers took the TKELS more than once and of that 47, some may have taken the test in different years. This did not allow for valid data in accessing teacher growth over three years. Because of the inconsistency in data reporting from districts, reliability is a concern of the OSE. Brainspring reported lower survey participation rates as well. Only 100 teachers completed the survey compared to 200 the previous school year.
To mitigate the impact low participation would have on the data collection, emails were sent to Special Education Directors to disseminate to teachers. The email included the importance of completing the surveys as one of the required SSIP activities. It was also explained how the results are used as an evaluation tool. Reminder emails were also sent in an effort to increase participation.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? Yes ▾

If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space).

In early March of 2020, many school districts began to close due to health and safety concerns caused by COVID-19. On March 19, 2020, Gov. Tate Reeves signed an executive order closing schools statewide through April 17, 2020. This executive order was extended and ultimately led to school closures through the end of the 2019-2020 school year.

Due to school closures data quality issues were a concern for the OSE. Survey participation of special education directors and SSIP literacy coaches were lower than anticipated. Due to the suspension of all federal and state assessment for the 2019-2020 school year because of the Covid-19 assessment data will not be available to address the SiMR.

To mitigate the impact low participation would have on the data collection, emails were sent to Special Education Directors to disseminate to teachers. The email included the importance of completing the surveys as one of the required SSIP activities. It was also explained how the results are used as an evaluation tool. Reminder emails were also sent in an effort to increase participation. The OSE will use the 2020-2021 school year to analyze data as a means of revising the SiMR. The analysis will include disaggregating the results data to determine critical areas of need.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Section B: Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission?   No   ⏷

If "Yes", please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action
(Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Did the State implement any <u>new</u> (previously or newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? No ▾

If "Yes", describe each <u>new</u> (previously or newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space)*.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy that the State <u>continued</u> to implement in the reporting period, including the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space).

The MDE OSE collaborated with other offices in the agency to provide professional development for educators to support the delivery of high quality, evidence-based literacy instruction for students with disabilities. The MDE OSE partnered with the Office of Elementary Education and Reading (OEER), the Office of School Improvement, and the Office of Professional Development to increase the number of special education teachers who participated in Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS) and Brainspring's Phonics First. In SY19-20, 75 teachers completed Phase II of LETRS resulting in 5640 teachers trained since 2014. The OSE continued to collaborate with other offices in the MDE to align efforts and resources to support the delivery of aligned, differentiated technical assistance to targeted districts to improve high quality, evidence-based literacy instruction for students with disabilities. The MDE OSE continued its partnership with the MDE OEER and MDE OSE staff by participating in learning walks to identify commendations, recommendations, and next steps for schools in SSIP districts to build capacity in the teaching force that is providing effective literacy instruction. 28 Literacy Learning Walks were completed by the school/district leadership teams in the fall and winter of the 2019-2020 SY. These learning walks provided a snapshot of instructional literacy practices and student learning by observing three key areas: instruction, routines/environments, and preparation/planning. Action plans were developed to improve areas identified during the learning walk. Based on the learning walks, the following was reported:100% of districts reported growth in aligning instruction to the College and Career Readiness Standards, data analysis, and the five components of reading; 86% of districts reported growth in small group teacher led instruction and implementation of center instruction; 57% of districts reported growth in writing in response to text; 86%of districts reported growth in utilization of higher order thinking questions; 43% of districts reported growth in differentiated instruction; and 100% of districts reported growth in student engagement
The MDE worked with educators across the State to develop The Access for All (AFA) Guide which addresses issues that impact learners with a wide variety of needs and promotes inclusive practices. This guide aids in providing quality classroom instruction for all students, including general education students and students with disabilities who receive instruction in general education settings. Hardcopies of the AFA were made available and a digital copy is available on the MDE website. The MDE Office of Professional Development also offers PD on Demand for the AFA document. AFA information was also shared at the following events: MS CEC Conference, Principal's Advisory Panel, Superintendent's Advisory Panel, and Mississippi Association of School Superintendents (MASS).

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Provide a description of how the State evaluated outcomes for each improvement strategy and how the evaluation data supports the decision to continue implementing the strategy. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):

The State evaluated outcomes using survey data. The districts completed the SSIP Infrastructure Analysis Survey. This survey assessed the current structures, systems, and processes in place in a school district that affect operational efficiency in the school district and, ultimately, impact student literacy proficiency. Of the districts that participated in SY19-20, 44% reported growth on the data-driven decision-making process compared to 38% growth report in the previous school year. The MDE OSE will continue implementing this strategy in order to increase teachers' capacity to develop instructional practices based on student needs. Districts reported 55% growth in the SY19-20 in identifying and addressing barriers to student success compared to 32% growth in the previous school year. Although growth was made, The MDE OSE will continue to increase improvements in the area of District-Level Support. Improvements in the area of district-level support can lead to teachers feeling more supported which should translate into teachers feeling more connected to the vision of the district and the efforts to increase student achievement. When there is a shared vision, students benefit from the instructional practices teachers implement when seeking to fulfill the district's vision.

The Literacy Instructional Capacity Survey was completed by all K-3 general and special education teachers in participating SSIP districts to gather perception data regarding their capacity to provide high quality, evidence-based literacy instruction to all students. Of the districts that participated, 55% reported growth in their capacity in SY19-20 which is an increase from 38% the previous year. Although teachers reported growth, The MDE OSE will continue implementing this improvement strategy in order to build teacher's capacity to effectively teach literacy skills. This growth in capacity building leads to better instructional practices which increases student engagement and better reading outcomes.

As evidenced by continued growth in decision making and in identifying and addressing barriers, the improvement strategies have made an impact on the infrastructure's success and will continue to be implemented. The MDE OSE understands that addressing skill gaps and making data-driven decisions will lead to an increase in student achievement.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space)**:**

In the 2020-2021 SY, the MDE OSE planned to fully adopt the MDE Literacy Coach model to implement Mississippi's Literacy-Based Promotion Act and the SSIP. SSIP Literacy Coaches were to be employed by the MDE OSE and work collaboratively with the Office of Elementary Education and Reading in the shared goal of improving literacy instruction to ALL students, thus improving outcomes for students with disabilities. Literacy Coaches were to be employed to support grades K-3 and 4-8 general and special education teachers. However, due to circumstances caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, the MDE OSE was not able to fully implement the MDE Literacy Coach model. The MDE OSE plans to move forward with the literacy coach model in the 2021-2022 SY.

The MDE OSE will continue to provide Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS) and Brainspring's Phonics First® course to teachers, interventionists, and literacy coaches across the State. This will increase teachers' capacity to provide instruction that will improve student outcomes around reading. Phonics First® will continue to be offered by Brainspring to instruct teachers in the use of multisensory literacy instructional strategies rooted in Orton-Gillingham methodology.

Professional Development Coordinators (PDCs) in the MDE, Office of Professional Development will continue to provide co-teaching and inclusion training, as well as providing technical assistance to districts as needed. These trainings are centered around ways to improve instructional practices for students with disabilities, which leads to strengthening reading skills. The PDCs also offer Online Canvas Courses and PD on Demand that allows teachers to participate in trainings based on his/her needs. This targeted PD allows teachers to grow their capacity to impact student literacy.

The OSE will provide support to districts based on their Determination Reports. Targeted technical assistance based on District Determination Report data will provide teachers with the skills needed to provide effective instruction in an inclusion setting and provide students with disabilities with the appropriate goals, accommodations/modifications, and services needed to strengthen their reading skills.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Did the State implement any <u>new</u> (previously or newly identified) evidence-based practices?

No ▾

If "Yes", describe the selection process for the <u>new</u> (previously or newly identified) evidence-based practices. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Provide a summary of the <u>continued</u> evidence-based practices and how the evidence-based practices are intended to impact the SiMR. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

At the beginning of the 2019-2020 school year, the MDE and Voyager transitioned to the new and revised LETRS 3rd Edition. This new edition consists of 8 units of study which participants must complete over a two-year period. LETRS training integrates innovative research-supported practices to deepen educator knowledge, directs and empowers educators as they develop a comprehensive road map for meeting standards-based outcomes, and sharpens educators' ability to diagnose why students are struggling and illustrates how to provide proven intervention.

Phonics First® is offered by Brainspring to instruct teachers in the use of multisensory literacy instructional strategies rooted in Orton-Gillingham methodology. The Phonics First® course provides an evidence-based program that teaches educators to explicitly and systematically deliver phonics-based, structured, multisensory, direct instruction to reach ALL students.

LETRS and Phonics First® trainings both provide teachers with the literacy capacity to provide high- quality, evidence-based practices that improves student's reading proficiency levels. LETRS provides teachers with the fundamentals of literacy instruction and gives them the skill they need to effectively teach the five components of reading. Phonics First® increases teacher knowledge on how to teach students systematic processes for decoding and encoding. This increases student's ability to read and spell. Both trainings equip teachers with the skills to provide effective literacy instruction that increases reading proficiency rates which leads to better student outcomes.

Describe the data collected to evaluate and monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space)*:*

A total of 28 Literacy Learning Walks were completed by the school/district leadership team in the fall and winter of the 2019-2020 SY. These learning walks provided a snapshot of instructional literacy practices and student learning. The three key areas of observations were instruction, routines/environments, and preparation/planning. Following the completion of the learning walk, action plans were developed to improve areas identified during the learning walk. Based on the learnig walks, the following was reported:

100% of districts reported growth in aligning instruction to the College and Career Readiness Standards, data analysis, and the five components of reading

86% of districts reported growth in small group teacher led instruction and implementation of center instruction

57% of districts reported growth in writing in response to text

86% reported growth in utilization of higher order thinking questions 43% reported growth in differentiated instruction

100% reported growth in student engagement

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Describe the components (professional development activities, policies/procedures revisions, and/or practices, etc.) implemented during the reporting period to support the knowledge and use of selected evidence-based practices. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

Professional Development Coordinators (PDCs) in the MDE, Office of Professional Development provided co-teaching and inclusion training, as well as provided technical assistance to districts as needed. Approximately 682 general and special education teachers received training from the PDCs in the SY 19-20. These trainings are centered around ways to improve instructional practices for students with disabilities, which leads to strengthening reading skills. The PDCs also offer Online Canvas Courses and PD on Demand that allows teachers to participate in trainings based on his/her needs. This targeted PD allows teachers to grow their capacity to impact student literacy.

LETRS and Phonics First® trainings provided teachers with the literacy capacity to provide high- quality, evidence-based practices that improves student's reading proficiency levels. LETRS provided teachers with the fundamentals of literacy instruction and gives them the skills they need to effectively teach the five components of reading. Building this capacity transforms student learning. Phonics First® increased teacher knowledge on how to teach students systematic processes for decoding and encoding which strengthens the student's ability to read and spell. Both trainings equipped teachers with the skills to provide effective literacy instruction which increases reading proficiency rates and improves student outcomes.

SSIP Literacy Coaches provided over 300 Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and PDs around the five components of reading. The literacy coaches provided technical assistance and coaching in assigned schools to support teacher and district goals of students achieving grade level reading by the end of 3rd grade.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.
(Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):

The MDE has made many efforts to engage stakeholders. The State Superintendent of Education spoke to the Mississippi Alliance of Nonprofits and Philanthropy about Mississippi's advancements in education. The Office of Elementary Education and Reading hosted teams and shared resources. Information about early literacy policies and outcomes was shared with the Council of Chief State School Officers. The OSE and OEER provided information about Phonics First® and LETRS trainings. The Mississippi Succeeds Report Card can be found on the MDE website. It gives stakeholders information about the reading achievements of each district in the State. Teachers and Speech Langauge Pathologists (SLP) were provided information pertaining to literacy trainings and resources via Listservs. Districts were emailed documents concerning thier survey data for use as they make decisions for the upcoming school year.
The MDE worked extremely hard to make sure stakeholders were engaged during the school closures due to COVID. The State Board of Education held monthly meetings virtually. During one such meeting, the State Superintendent of Education, provided resources for online and distance learning. Meetings were conducted with the Teacher's Advisory Panel to determine what had been sucessful, what teachers struggled with, and what teachers wished they had known prior to COVID. During their monthly meetings, literacy coaches discussed the difficulties of providing virtual coaching and ways to improve their support. Information was broadcasted on mediums such as Mississippi Public Broadcast Network (MPB) to ensure as many stakeholders as possible were made aware of the steps Mississippi educators were taking to provide quality instruction during these unprecedented times.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities?

Yes ▾

If "Yes", describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.
(Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space)*:*

Due to school closures, many stakeholders had concerns pertaining to providing effective instruction. The MDE developed an Updates and Information in Response to COVID-19 (Coronavirus). This information was released daily via Listserv and could be found on the MDE website. For example, stakeholders wanted to know about providing online services to students with disabilities. The OSE provided guidance to stakeholders on providing services in accordance with IDEA and that students with disabilities must have the same access as the general population. Stakeholders were also concerned about literacy support. The OEER provided guidance on virtual coaching. The MDE continues to provide the "Important MDE Announcements" to stakeholders on subjects such as Phonics First® trainings, Superintendent's Annual Report, Literacy PD for Leaders, and the MS Connects Summit. The OSE provides Virutal Office Hours twice a week to provide technical assistance, resources, and trainings to Special Education Directors.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

If applicable, describe the action(s) that the State implemented to address any FFY 2018 SPP/APR required OSEP response. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):

On Tuesday, July 21, 2020, the OSE received an email from OSEP pertaining to some information about how to obtain more details regarding the 508 issues on our SSIP. We were informed that it was possible to run a 508 Accessibility Report. However, it apparently had to be done by the OSE. Once this was done, we would receive information on what the issue was, where it was in the document, and whether our actions fixed the issues.

The OSE responded on Tuesday, July 21, 2020. We informed OSEP that those steps had been taken and the only feedback received was one TIP, which was subsequentially attached. The SSIP document has been posted to the MDE website.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.