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VISION

MISSION

To provide leadership through the development of policy and accountability systems so that all students are prepared to compete in the global community
MISSISSIPPI STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS

1. All Students Proficient and Showing Growth in All Assessed Areas
2. Every Student Graduates from High School and is Ready for College and Career
3. Every Child Has Access to a High-Quality Early Childhood Program
4. Every School Has Effective Teachers and Leaders
5. Every Community Effectively Uses a World-Class Data System to Improve Student Outcomes
6. Every School and District is Rated “C” or Higher
Webinar Targets:

Part 1:
• Provide overview of identification and exit
• Provide overview of data spreadsheets given to schools

Part 2:
• Provide overview of implementation requirements for plans, funding, and comprehensive needs assessment interviews
  • Schools with Federal Designation (CSI, TSI, ATSI)
  • Schools with State Designation (SAR)
  • Schools with Both State and Federal Designations (CSI, TSI, ATSI, and SAR)
Long-term Goals: Student Proficiency
Long-term Goals: Graduation Rate
Mississippi Academic Assessment Program (MAAP)

English Language Arts (ELA) Levels 4 & 5
- 2016: 33.6%
- 2017: 36.7%
- 2018: 39.8%
- 2019: 41.6%

Mathematics Levels 4 & 5
- 2016: 33.0%
- 2017: 38.6%
- 2018: 43.9%
- 2019: 47.3%
English Language Arts and Mathematics Proficiency Gains in Districts

Total districts with more than 45% of students scoring proficient or advanced

- English Language Arts: more than tripled
  - 2016: 14
  - 2019: 48

- Mathematics: more than quadrupled
  - 2016: 14
  - 2019: 62
Percent of Districts and Schools Rated “C” or Higher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Districts</th>
<th></th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By state law we are required to identify Schools At-Risk and conduct an evaluation, provide assistance and report on those schools that are in need of improvement (MS Code 37-18-3 and 37-18-5).

By federal law (ESSA) we are required to identify schools that are identified as Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), & Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) schools beginning with the 2018-19 school year.

The MS State Consolidated Plan, also known as MS Succeeds provides the specific criteria for identifying and addressing schools as required by ESSA.
Identification
School Improvement Identification Criteria

CSI
- Graduation rate less than or equal to 67%; OR
- Bottom 5% of Title IA schools; OR
- Previously identified Additional TSI school with 3 consecutive years of subgroup proficiency performance (no improvement)… *ID begins in the 2021-22 School Year*

TSI – Consistently Underperforming Subgroup
- 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
- Results are rank-ordered and bottom 5% are identified for TSI

ATSI – Low Performing Subgroup
- 3-year average subgroup performance is at or below that of all students in the lowest performing schools (CSI)

School At-Risk – State Designation
- School level accountability grade of F
Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

Frequency of Identification
- Every 3 years

MDE Support
- Approve, monitor, and review plan
- Provide funding to support evidence-based interventions
- Provide technical assistance as requested/needed (face to face/virtual)
- Leadership meetings and webinars (some meetings may be held regionally)
Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

Frequency of Identification
- Annually

MDE Support
- Provide funding to support evidence-based interventions (if available)
- Provide technical assistance (face to face/virtual)
- Leadership meetings and webinars (some meetings may be held regionally)
School At-Risk (SAR)

Frequency of Identification
- Annually

MDE Support
- Provide access to technical assistance as requested/needed
- Leadership meetings and webinars (some meetings may be held regionally)
Additional TSI (ATSI)

**Frequency of Identification**
- **Annually** *(identification based on most recent 3-year data trend)*

**MDE Support**
- Provide funding to support evidence-based interventions (if available)
- Provide technical assistance as requested/needed (face to face/virtual)
- Leadership meetings and webinars (some meetings may be held regionally)
DATA FILES

- District Detail Data File
- TSI Ranking File
- ATSI File
- TSI Exiting File
- ATSI Exiting File
- Summary File
District Detail Data
• Each district received a file with their detailed data (for all schools)

• The file contains data for any subgroup that met the minimum n-size in 2018-19 to calculate an accountability score

• The file contains data for those subgroups for 2018-19, 2017-18, and 2016-17 school years
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>SCHID</td>
<td>Subgroup</td>
<td>Subgroup 3-Year Avg Subgroup Score</td>
<td>School Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0130</td>
<td>0130-020</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>396 374</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0130</td>
<td>0130-020</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>361 374</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0130</td>
<td>0130-020</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>365 374</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0130</td>
<td>0130-020</td>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>407 383</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0130</td>
<td>0130-020</td>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>369 383</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0130</td>
<td>0130-020</td>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>372 383</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0130</td>
<td>0130-020</td>
<td>Students w/Disabilities</td>
<td>Did not meet n-size for 3 years</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0130</td>
<td>0130-020</td>
<td>Students w/Disabilities</td>
<td>Did not meet n-size for 3 years</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0130</td>
<td>0130-020</td>
<td>Students w/Disabilities</td>
<td>237 Did not meet n-size for 3 years</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0130</td>
<td>0130-020</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Did not meet n-size for 3 years</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0130</td>
<td>0130-020</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Did not meet n-size for 3 years</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0130</td>
<td>0130-020</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>366 Did not meet n-size for 3 years</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
District Detail Data – File Contents

- Column A – District ID
- Column B – School ID
- Column C – Subgroup name
- Column D – Subgroup accountability score (If the score is blank, the n-size was not met)
• Column E – Subgroup 3-year average accountability score (Only calculated when the n-size was met for all 3 years)

• Column F – School Year

• Columns G through AR – Accountability data/components used to calculate accountability scores
District Detail Data

- The data contained in the district detail file was used to calculate TSI and ATSI identification.

- ATSI identification is determined based on the 3-year average subgroup accountability score.

- Cut points for ATSI:
  - 249 for 700-point schools
  - 477 for 1000-point schools
• This file contains information about each school/subgroup and the criteria for TSI identification

• There are 2 tabs in the spreadsheet: one for 700-point schools and one for 1000-point schools
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Math 3-year</th>
<th>Math Improvement</th>
<th>Math Bottom 25%</th>
<th>Math Bottom Improvement</th>
<th>English 3-year</th>
<th>English Improvement</th>
<th>English Bottom 25%</th>
<th>English Bottom Improvement</th>
<th>TSI Eligible</th>
<th>RANKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students w/Disabilities</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>87 Y</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-68.8</td>
<td>0.0005143 Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>-67.8</td>
<td>-0.0010565 Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students w/Disabilities</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>110 Y</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>-60.6</td>
<td>0.0004072 Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>-60.1</td>
<td>-0.0004452 Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students w/Disabilities</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>113 Y</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>-64.2</td>
<td>0.0005223 Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>-64</td>
<td>-0.0004944 Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students w/Disabilities</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>115 Y</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-68.2</td>
<td>0.0007143 Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>-64.9</td>
<td>0.0004552 Y</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students w/Disabilities</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>121 Y</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>-63.2</td>
<td>-0.0003538 Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>-62.2</td>
<td>0.000096 Y</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students w/Disabilities</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>131 Y</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>-66.9</td>
<td>0 Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>-69.2</td>
<td>0 Y</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students w/Disabilities</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>132 Y</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>-68.6</td>
<td>0.0002229 Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>-68.8</td>
<td>0.0000149 Y</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students w/Disabilities</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>133 Y</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>-63.7</td>
<td>0.0000318 Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>-64.6</td>
<td>-0.0003329 Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ranking for TSI – File Contents

• Column A – School ID
• Columns B and C – District and School Name
• Column D – Subgroup
• Column E – School Type (600, 700, or 1000 points)
• Column F – Subgroup Accountability Score
• Column G – Bottom 50%

• If the subgroup’s accountability score was in the lowest 50%, this column will be marked “Y”

• If the column is marked “Y”, this school/subgroup combination has met the first criteria for TSI
Column H – The 3-year average proficiency rate for this subgroup in Math.

If the n-size was not met in all 3 years, the rate is not calculated. The Gap and Improvement calculations for Math will not be calculated.
Column I – Math Gap: The gap between the state goal (70%) and the 3-year average

Formula: (3-Year Average) – 70

If the Math 3-year Average for the school/subgroup is at 70% or above, the Gap and Improvement calculations for Math will not be calculated.
Ranking for TSI – File Contents

• Column J – Math Improvement: The progress being made from 2016-17 to 2018-19 towards meeting the state goal (70%)

\[
\text{Formula: } \frac{(2016-17 \text{ Proficiency} - 70) - (2018-19 \text{ Proficiency} - 70)}{(2016-17 \text{ Proficiency} - 70)}
\]

• If the Math 3-year Average for the school/subgroup is at 70% or above, the Gap and Improvement calculations for Math will not be calculated.
• Column K – **Math** Bottom 25% Gap

• If the subgroup’s Gap value was in the lowest 25%, this column will be marked “Y”

• Column L – **Math** Bottom 25% Improvement

• If the subgroup’s Improvement value was in the lowest 25%, this column will be marked “Y”
• Column M – Math Eligible
• This column will be marked “Eligible” when the following conditions are met:

  School/subgroup was in the Bottom 50% \textbf{AND}

  3-year average was below 70% \textbf{AND}

  Math Gap was in the Bottom 25% \textbf{AND}

  Math Improvement was in the Bottom 25%
Column N – The 3-year average proficiency rate for this subgroup in English.

If the n-size was not met in all 3 years, the rate is not calculated. The Gap and Improvement calculations for English will not be calculated.
Column O – **English** Gap: The gap between the state goal (70%) and the 3-year average

Formula: \((3\text{-Year Average}) - 70\)

If the **English** 3-year Average for the school/subgroup is at 70% or above, the Gap and Improvement calculations for **English** will not be calculated.
• Column P – English Improvement: The progress being made from 2016-17 to 2018-19 towards meeting the state goal (70%)

    Formula: \[
    \frac{(2016-17 \ Proficiency - 70) - (2018-19 \ Proficiency - 70)}{(2016-17 \ Proficiency - 70)}
    \]

• If the English 3-year Average for the school/subgroup is at 70% or above, the Gap and Improvement calculations for English will not be calculated.
Ranking for TSI – File Contents

• Column Q – English Bottom 25% Gap
  • If the subgroup’s Gap value was in the lowest 25%, this column will be marked “Y”

• Column R – English Bottom 25% Improvement
  • If the subgroup’s Improvement value was in the lowest 25%, this column will be marked “Y”
• Column S – **English Eligible**

• This column will be marked “Eligible” when the following conditions are met:

  School/subgroup was in the Bottom 50% **AND**

  3-year average was below 70% **AND**

  **English** Gap was in the Bottom 25% **AND**

  **English** Improvement was in the Bottom 25%
• **Column T – TSI Eligible**

• This column will be marked “Eligible” when the following conditions are met:

  School/subgroup was in the Bottom 50% **AND**

  **EITHER**

  *Math Eligibility was met (Column M) OR*

  *English Eligibility was met (Column S)*
• Column T – Ranking

• If the school/subgroup is Eligible for TSI, they are ranked by subgroup accountability score

• The number of schools identified for TSI is based on the total number of schools in Mississippi, resulting in 5% of schools being identified.

  For 700-point schools, this is 30 schools

  For 1000-point schools, this is 12 schools
• Column V – TSI Identification

• For 700-point schools, the bottom 30 schools that are not continuing CSI or ATSI schools are identified for TSI

• For 1000-point schools, the bottom 12 schools that are not continuing CSI or ATSI schools are identified for TSI

• For both 700 and 1000-point schools that were TSI last year and did NOT exit, this column will be marked “Y”
### Ranking for TSI – File Contents

- **Column W – Last year’s TSI Identification**
  - Indicates if school was identified for TSI last year

- **Column X – Identified as TSI both years**
  - Indicates if school was identified for TSI last year AND meets TSI identification criteria this year
• Column Y – Continuing CSI or ATSI school

Indicates if school was identified as CSI or ATSI last year and did not exit

These schools may meet the criteria for TSI, but are not identified for TSI due to prior identification
## ATSI Files

### Spreadsheet for ATSI Data

#### 600/700-Point Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHID</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>SUBGROUP</th>
<th>2018-19 Subgroup Score</th>
<th>2017-2018 Subgroup Score</th>
<th>2016-2017 Subgroup Score</th>
<th>3-Year Average Subgroup Score</th>
<th>600-700 Cutpoint</th>
<th>ATSI Continuing</th>
<th>ATSI Exiting</th>
<th>Not Identified for TSI (ATSI Continuing)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>600-012</td>
<td>NORTH PIKE SCHOOL DISTRICT</td>
<td>NORTH PIKE MIDDLE SCHOOL</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-013</td>
<td>PASCAGOUA GAITER SCHOOL DIST</td>
<td>SINGING RIVER ACADEMY</td>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-070</td>
<td>DESOTO CO SCHOOL DIST</td>
<td>OVERPARK ELEMENTARY</td>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-020</td>
<td>LEAK CO SCHOOL DIST</td>
<td>LEAK CENTRAL JUNIOR HIGH</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-016</td>
<td>DESOTO CO SCHOOL DIST</td>
<td>OAK GROVE CENTRAL ELEMENTARY</td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-060</td>
<td>LAMAR COUNTY DISTRICT</td>
<td>LONGBEＡLE ELEMENTARY</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-014</td>
<td>BOONVILLE SCHOOL DIST</td>
<td>R.J.L. LONG BOONVILLE MIDDLE SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-022</td>
<td>CANTON PUBLIC SCHOOL DIST</td>
<td>JIMMY M. GOODLOE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-014</td>
<td>HANCOCK CO SCHOOL DIST</td>
<td>WEST HANCOCK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-080</td>
<td>GULFPORT SCHOOL DIST</td>
<td>CENTRAL ELEM</td>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-006</td>
<td>GULFPORT SCHOOL DIST</td>
<td>GULFPORT UPPER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-070</td>
<td>DESOTO CO SCHOOL DIST</td>
<td>OVERPARK ELEMENTARY</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-084</td>
<td>DESOTO CO SCHOOL DIST</td>
<td>LAKE COMORANT MIDDLE</td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Spreadsheet for ATSI Data

#### 1000-Point Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHID</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>SUBGROUP</th>
<th>2018-19 Subgroup Score</th>
<th>2017-2018 Subgroup Score</th>
<th>2016-2017 Subgroup Score</th>
<th>3-Year Average Subgroup Score</th>
<th>1000 Cutpoint</th>
<th>ATSI Continuing</th>
<th>ATSI Exiting</th>
<th>Not Identified for TSI (ATSI Continuing)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300-008</td>
<td>VICKSBURG WARREN SCHOOL DIST</td>
<td>WARREN CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td>Students w/Disabilities</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>477</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-080</td>
<td>GULFPORT SCHOOL DIST</td>
<td>GULFPORT HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-006</td>
<td>MADISON CO SCHOOL DIST</td>
<td>RIDGEONTALN HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-016</td>
<td>HARRISON CO SCHOOL DIST</td>
<td>HARRISON CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-092</td>
<td>PASCAGOUA GAITER SCHOOL DIST</td>
<td>GAITER HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td>Students w/Disabilities</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>477</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-011</td>
<td>GEORGE CO SCHOOL DIST</td>
<td>GEORGE COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td>Students w/Disabilities</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>477</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-005</td>
<td>HANCOCK CO SCHOOL DIST</td>
<td>RACHEL HOBBS ELementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exit Criteria
## Exit Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation (What is my label?)</th>
<th>Duration (How long will the designation last?)</th>
<th>Exit Criteria (What will I need to do to be removed from the designation?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) | ❑ 3 years                                    | ❑ After 3 years and graduation rate above 67%  
❑ After 3 years and 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 |
| Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) | ❑ 1 year, unless re-identified in subsequent year | ❑ School no longer meets criteria for identification  
❑ 3-year average growth in subgroup proficiency exceeds target proficiency growth rate projected for the same statewide subgroup |
| Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) | ❑ Same as TSI                                | ❑ Subgroup performance above that of all students in the lowest performing 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 |
| School At-Risk (SAR)                |                                              | ❑ Improve accountability grade to D or higher |
TSI Exiting File
This file contains information about each school/subgroup and the criteria for TSI exit.
The file contains data for all schools and subgroups that were identified for TSI in the prior year.
TSI Exiting File

- Column A – School ID
- Columns B and C – District and School Name
- Column D – Subgroup
- Column E – School Type (700 or 1000 point)
• Column F – The three-year average growth for English
• Column G – The three-year average growth for Math
• Three-year average growth:

Average of (18-19 Proficiency minus 17-18 Proficiency),
(17-18 Proficiency minus 16-17 Proficiency), and
(16-17 Proficiency minus 15-16 Proficiency)
Column H – Did the school continue TSI identification for English?

Column I – Did the school exit TSI for English?

Column J – Did the school continue TSI identification for Math?

Column K – Did the school exit TSI for Math?
# TSI Growth Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>English Growth Target</th>
<th>Math Growth Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students w/ Disabilities</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>6.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaskan Native or Native American</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>5.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deciles

• To account for the subgroup differences, calculations were run for each subgroup to determine necessary progress.

• Given that the requirement to exit was an improvement in letter grade (or a movement across the midpoint of a letter grade), a decile system was set up.

• Each of the five “letter grade” ranges is comprised of two decile ranges. Moving from one decile to the next higher decile would allow for a subgroup to meet this particular requirement.
ATSI Exiting File

- This file contains information about each school/subgroup and the criteria for ATSI exit.
- The file contains data for all schools and subgroups that were identified for ATSI in the prior year.
ATSI Exiting File

- Column A – School ID
- Columns B and C – District and School Name
- Column D – Subgroup
• Column E – The three-year average subgroup accountability score

• Column F – The cut point for identification
  
  249 for 600/700 Point Schools
  
  477 for 1000 Point Schools
ATSI Exiting File

- Column G – Is the 3-year average above the current cut point? (First Criteria)
- Column H – The prior year’s subgroup accountability score
- Column I – The prior year’s subgroup accountability decile group
ATSI Exiting File

• Column J – The current year’s subgroup accountability score
• Column K – The current year’s subgroup accountability decile group
Column L – Is the school/subgroup a continuing ATSI school/subgroup?

Subgroup 3-year average is not above the cut point AND/OR current year decile is less than or equal to the prior year decile
• Column M – Did the school/subgroup exit ATSI?

Subgroup did not meet the n-size for the current year

OR

Subgroup 3-year average is above the cut point AND current year decile is above the prior year decile
## ATSI Decile Groups 700 Point

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students w/ Disabilities</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: scores listed are the highest value of each group
### ATSI Decile Groups 1000 Point

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students w/ Disabilities</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: scores listed are the highest value of each group
Questions
Implementation Process
Abundance of Plans
Implementation

Then a miracle occurs

Good work, but I think we need just a little more detail right here!
Schools that Will NOT Engage in the Interview Process

TSI & ATSI schools that do not have a Rating of F

Plan Development
- Comprehensive Needs Assessment
- Funding Application Completion, Submission and Approval

Plan Implementation

TSI & ATSI schools require LEA Approval for Plans and both LEA and MDE Approval for Funding Applications

Support and Monitoring (District)
Schools that Engage in the Interview Process

All Schools with a Rating of F (School At-Risk) and CSI schools will participate in the interview process.

Artifacts
- MDE Interview Process

Interview
- Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Feedback
- MDE Interview Process

Plan Development & Funding Approval

Plan Implementation

Support and Monitoring

**SAR** schools require LEA Approval for Plans – No Funding Awarded

**CSI** schools require LEA and MDE Approval for Plans and Funding Applications (Funding Awarded)
## School Improvement Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensive Needs Assessment</th>
<th>MDE Interview Process</th>
<th>Plan Development</th>
<th>LEA Plan Approval</th>
<th>MDE Plan Approval</th>
<th>20% School’s Title I Reservation</th>
<th>SI Funding (1003a)*</th>
<th>P16 Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSI</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATSI</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAR (Any School with F Rating)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pending Availability of Funds and Title I Eligibility

Any school with an F Rating regardless of SI Identification must engage in the MDE Interview Process.
By state law we are to categorize all programs and activities based on evidence of effectiveness (MS Code 27-103-159).

By federal law we are required to select and implement evidence-based programs when using federal funds (Every Student Succeeds Act).

By State Board of Education expectations, we are to create a world-class educational system that gives students the knowledge and skills to be successful in college and the workforce. To obtain this vision, we must use evidence-based practices/programs with a proven track record of success.
• Each Title I, School Improvement 1003(a) plan must:
  • Include long-term goals for student performance &
  • Include evidence-based interventions

• Every Student Succeeds Act (2016), Section 1003
## Levels of Evidence

**Category One**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Evidence Type</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strong Evidence</td>
<td>Based on at least 1 well-designed and well-implemented experimental study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderate Evidence</td>
<td>Based on at least 1 well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Promising Evidence</td>
<td>Based on at least 1 well-designed and well-implemented correlational study with statistical controls for selection bias</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REQUIRED WHEN USING SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS**

**Category Two**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Rationale Type</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Demonstrates a Rationale</td>
<td>Includes ongoing efforts to examine the effects of such activity, strategy, or intervention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSIDERED FOR ALL OTHER USES OF EVIDENCE-BASED**
Evidence-based Requirements

Evidence-Based Resources

- What Works Clearinghouse: developed by the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) (not categorized in ESSA evidence tiers; studies included here meet only most rigorous evidence criteria)
- Results First Clearinghouse Database: developed by the Pew Charitable Trusts (not categorized in ESSA evidence tiers; evaluates interventions as rated by eight national databases)
- Best Evidence Encyclopedia: developed by the Center for Data-Driven Reform in Education at Johns Hopkins University (not categorized in ESSA evidence tiers)
- Evidence for ESSA: developed by Johns Hopkins University (categorized in ESSA evidence tiers)
- RAND report on school leadership interventions under ESSA (categorized in ESSA evidence tiers)
- Next Generation High Schools: developed by the U.S. Department of Education (not categorized in ESSA evidence tiers)
- Roadmap to Evidence Based Reform for Low Graduation Rate High Schools, developed by the Every Student Graduates Center at Johns Hopkins University
- Results for America: RFA advocates for programs and practices that use evidence and data to improve quality
- Preschool Curriculum Report: developed by the National Center on Quality Teaching and Learning
- SERP Institute: Strategic Education Research Partnership
- SIG Network: a library of relevant tools and resources
- Synthesis of Evidence Resources: a synthesis of resources and literature on evidence-based practices in school improvement
- National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance; NCEE conducts unbiased, large-scale evaluations of education programs supported by federal funds
- Ed Reports: educator-led, evidence-based reviews of K-12 instructional materials
- Implementing Evidence-Based Literacy Practices: developed by the Florida Center for Reading Research
- Evidence Provisions within ESSA: MDE PowerPoint Presentation, March 2017
- High-Performance Leadership: Darden/Curry Partnership for Leaders in Education (PLE), is a joint venture of the University Of Virginia Darden School Of Business and the Curry School of Education

School Improvement
- 601-359-1003
- Staff
- FAQ

Services
- Evidence-Based Programs

Revision Request
- School Improvement

Links
- Mississippi Succeeds Plan
- Cohort IV Renewals
- School Improvement Grants (SIG) Information Center 1003 (g)

Resources
- Evidence-Based Programs
- "Evidence-Based" Defined
- USOE Non-Regulatory Guidance: Using Evidence to Strengthen Education Investments
- Identifying Evidence-Based Programs
What’s Next for Non-Interviewing Schools?

Develop Plan of Action
Address areas that caused the identification (subgroup)
Include evidence-based interventions (strong, moderate, promising)
Complete Funding Application, if awarded

Approve Plan
Submit Local School Board (LSB) approved plan and funding, if awarded, through MCAPS

Following Approval of Plan and Funding Application

Provide **monthly update** during the LSB meeting and upload into the MCAPS LEA Document Library (Template provided at [https://www.mdek12.org/OSI/forms](https://www.mdek12.org/OSI/forms)

Implementation of Plan TSI/ATSI

**District monitoring of Plan Implementation**
Plan and Funding

MCAPS

Mississippi Comprehensive Automated Performance-based System
Log in to MCAPS → Select School Year 2020 → Click on “Show Folders” → Expand the “School Improvement Documentation” by clicking the (+)

Expand/Select the appropriate category (CSI, TSI, etc.) → Select the document by clicking on “Edit” → Click “Upload Document”
What’s Next for Non-Interviewing Schools?

2019 School Improvement Convening

Lake Terrace Convention Center
Hattiesburg, MS
October 15-16, 2019

Team consisting of administrator, federal programs director, Instructional Staff member (lead teacher, curriculum director, special education director)

www.mdek12.org/osi
Updates

• Identification letters (CSI, TSI, ATSI, and SAR) are being emailed to districts this week for 103 districts representing 259 schools.

• Districts will be permitted to register additional participants above the limit of four (4) at this time.

• Registering additional slots for your team is on a first-come, first-served basis (registration closes October 10th).
Comprehensive Needs Assessment Interview

District/School Team

November 1-18, 2019
Improving Outcomes for ALL Children

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Interview

(Insert Name of School & District)

Insert Name of Principal and Superintendent

Please do not modify template formatting (these slides are to serve as the template that will be used to outline The root cause analysis and plan of action for the school).
Every Child Has Access to a High-Quality Early Childhood Program

Every School Has Effective Teachers and Leaders

Every Community Effectively Uses a World-Class Data System to Improve Student Outcomes

Every School and District is Rated “C” or Higher
Name of District

School’s Vision
School’s Mission
School’s Goals
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## School Snapshot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance Data Trend</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>2019-20 (current)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Attendance (ADA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Attendance Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Absenteeism Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Configuration of School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Briefly address the school’s strategy/response to address the attendance data trends provided in the chart and the next steps to address Chronic Absenteeism in the school.

Student ADA and Chronic Absenteeism:

Teacher Attendance:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Certified Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Limited Service Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Turnover Rate (percent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Teachers rated ≥ 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability Rating &amp; Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Briefly address the school’s strategy/response to the staffing data trends provided in the chart on the previous slide.

Recruitment

Retention
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELA Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Grade ELA Pass Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-Readiness Post Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### School Snapshot (MAAP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELA Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algebra I Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology I Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. History Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retesters (Percent/Number)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algebra I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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After a review of proficiency rates and graduation rate for the school, please address the correlation between the two for your school.
Briefly address the evidence-base and research behind the specific strategies that were used in the prior 3 years to address identified needs and the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What Evidence-based strategies were utilized?</th>
<th>How did outcomes demonstrate provision of equitable practices to support improved outcomes for all groups of learners?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Briefly address the next steps based on the data analysis.
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Describe the top strengths in your School/District that were uncovered through deep examination of the following areas: *(Please Bullet)*

- Use of Instructional Resources/Materials (Curriculums Used Across the System for Literacy, Math, Science and History)
- Student Performance (Academic Achievement, Acceleration, CCR, Grad Rate, etc.) and closing gaps based on disaggregation of student achievement data.
- Multi-tiered System of Support Implementation (Quality Tier I Instruction, Early Warning Indicators addressing attendance, behavior and course performance, and Interventions)
- Fiscal and Human Resources
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Describe the most critical gaps identified by your school that were uncovered through deep examination of the following areas: (Please Bullet)

- Use of Instructional Resources/Materials (Curriculums Used Across the System for Literacy, Math, Science and History)
- Student Performance (Academic Achievement, Acceleration, CCR, Grad Rate, etc.) and closing gaps based on disaggregation of student achievement data.
- Multi-tiered System of Support Implementation (Quality Tier I Instruction, Early Warning Indicators addressing attendance, behavior and course performance, and Interventions)
- Fiscal and Human Resources
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Summary of 1st Quarter Benchmark/Interim Performance

Identify the Interim/Benchmark Assessment being utilized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Interim/Benchmark Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often is the assessment administered?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019-20 Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Summary of Key Findings

Describe how the findings from this analysis will inform the school's actions in the provision of equitable access to a quality instructional program for ALL student subgroups in your school (effective teachers, instructional practices, professional learning, and the utilization of supplemental funding).

Describe how the district is addressing the academic outcomes of the lowest performing subgroups in the school.
Address specific next steps based on the data analysis in the table provided. (Please address a minimum of 1 strategy per domain)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Priority Strategy</th>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
<th>Position Responsible</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Transformation (Instruction and Assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Shift (Equity, Culturally Responsive Teaching, Parent and Community Engagement)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Complete the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Per Pupil Amount</th>
<th>Use/Activity</th>
<th>Anticipated Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Does the school currently have external providers that support the instructional practices of the school? If yes, identify those providers, their scope of work, the frequency of services, the number of years used between 2016-17 and 2019-20, and the process used to measure provider efficacy (Complete the Chart Below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>External Provider (Consultant Group)</th>
<th>Area of Support/Expected Outcome</th>
<th>Frequency of Support</th>
<th>Performance Outcome (Proficiency)/(Growth)</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Does the district currently have partnerships with regional educational service agencies (i.e. RESA) or other educational service groups? If yes, identify those providers, their scope of work, the frequency of services, the number of years used between 2016-17 and 2019-20, and the process used to measure provider efficacy. (Complete the Chart Below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESA(s) (PREPS, SRESA, GCEIC, RCU)</th>
<th>Area of Support/Expected Outcome</th>
<th>Frequency of Support</th>
<th>Performance Outcome (Proficiency)/(Growth)</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resource Analysis: District Supports

Briefly describe the return on investment in terms of improved student performance based on the analysis of external provider and regional educational service agency supports provided to the school.
Briefly describe the type of support will the district provide to the school to improve performance outcomes during the 2019-20 school year?
Planning for Long-Term Sustainability

• What are your strategies to sustain improvement efforts created through your plan?

• Which MDE Resources have you utilized to support your work?

• Which MDE Resources did you find the most helpful and impactful?

• What is the most feasible and effective way that the MDE can support you with the gaps identified through this root cause analysis?
Questions from State Team

(List the name and title of each school and district team member who is present at the interview so that clarifying questions may be directed to specific individuals)
The Interview Presentation Process

- Develop and submit a PowerPoint presentation through MCAPS using MDE designed template
- Submit specific artifacts through MCAPS
  - School Staff Summary (Total #certified staff: by grade, subject area, license type, years of experience (0, 1-3, 5-10, +10) – please do not provide names of personnel)
  - Intervention Programs and schedule (include documentation of evidence-base)
  - External Providers (years used, scope of work, and outcome expectation, RFP)
  - Dropout Prevention Plan for High Schools
  - School Professional Development Plan
  - District Professional Development Plan
- Interview between MDE team and the district team that is comprised of a school board member, superintendent, school principal, teacher representative, and parent/community member
- Receive Verbal and Written Feedback from the MDE Team
- Submit SAR Plan for Local School Board (LSB) Approval – **Using Action Plan Template Provided by MDE**
- Submit the LSB Approved Plan Revisions to MDE for Approval (CSI Only)
- If Funding Awarded – Submit LSB Approved Funding Application to MDE for Approval (must have federal designation)
- Support/Monitoring from MDE (CSI Schools/ATSI F-schools)
Presentation Overview

- **Who:** Select 1-2 members from your district interview team to deliver the presentation.

- **What:** Deliver a 30-minute presentation that provides a narrative of the school’s current status/context and next steps to address causes for identification.

- **When:** Presentations must be submitted to the Review Committee no later than October 21, 2019, via MCAPS. Interviews will take place November 1-18, 2019.

- **How:** Each school will receive a pre-scheduled time to present within a 75-minute block (30 minutes to present, 15 minutes for Q&A, 15 minutes for state team debrief, and 15 minutes for verbal feedback with school and district team).

- **Where:** Schools will be scheduled to present in Jackson, MS.
PowerPoint Guidelines

A PowerPoint template has been created for School/District presentations. School/Districts must use the template as provided.

- School/Districts should not add photos, change the color of the template or the font.
- The only portion of the template the School/District may customize is the content, which should be provided in sentences, bulleted concepts, tables, charts or graphs.
- PowerPoints must have no more than 28 slides, not including the title, MDE Goals, or questions slide;
- Presentations must be 30 minutes or less; and,
- Fonts may be no smaller than 18pt.

Note: Suggested slide limits have been given as additional guidance.
What’s Next for Identified Schools?

Before the Interview

• Convene leadership teams
• Identify team responsible for drafting interview presentation
• Identify lead presenter for the interview presentation (1-2 individuals from the school)
• Confirm interview date, time, and location
• A team should attend School Improvement Convening consisting of administrator, federal programs director, instructional staff member (lead teacher, curriculum director, special education director) **Date of Convening: October 15th -16th**
• Submit requested artifacts by October 21st (Must be uploaded to the LEA Document Library)

Interview at MDE
What’s Next for Identified Schools?

• **Following the interview**
  - Finalize plan
    - District’s actions to support school
    - School’s actions to have improvement outcomes

• Submit Local School Board (LSB) approved plan through MCAPS
  - Revisions to CSI plans require MDE approval
  - TSI/ATSI plans require LSB approval
  - SAR plans require LSB approval

• Provide **monthly update** during the local school board meeting and upload into MCAPS each month (LEA Document Library)

• Implementation of Plan
Plan and Funding

MCAPS
Mississippi Comprehensive Automated Performance-based System
Log in to MCAPS

Select School Year 2020

Click on "Show Folders"

Expand the “School Improvement Documentation” by clicking the (+)

Expand/Select the appropriate category (CSI, TSI, etc.)

Select the document by clicking on “Edit”

Click “Upload Document”
What’s Next for Non-Interviewing Schools?

2019 School Improvement Convening

Lake Terrace Convention Center
Hattiesburg, MS
October 15-16, 2019

Team consisting of administrator, federal programs director, Instructional Staff member (lead teacher, curriculum director, special education director)

www.mdek12.org/osi
# School Improvement Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Shakinna Patterson, Ed.S.</td>
<td>Director of School Improvement Programs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:spatterson@mdek12.org">spatterson@mdek12.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. BoNita Harris</td>
<td>Director of Program Monitoring and Support</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bharris@mdek12.org">bharris@mdek12.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sharita Giles</td>
<td>Coordinator of School Improvement Programs – MCAPS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sgiles@mdek12.org">sgiles@mdek12.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Noleen Clark</td>
<td>Coordinator of School Improvement Programs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nclark@mdek12.org">nclark@mdek12.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Re'Nona Jackson</td>
<td>Program Office Manager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rjackson@mdeki.org">rjackson@mdeki.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Jeanne Park</td>
<td>Lead Implementation Specialist/UM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jeanne.park@mdek12.org">jeanne.park@mdek12.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Lekeisha Sutton</td>
<td>Lead School Improvement Coach/UM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lsutton@mdek12.org">lsutton@mdek12.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Michael McDonald</td>
<td>Lead School Improvement Coach/UM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mimcdonald@mdek12.org">mimcdonald@mdek12.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. A’Lisa Bryant</td>
<td>Fiscal Office Manager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:abryant@mdeki.org">abryant@mdeki.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Office of School Improvement**

359 North West St.
P. O. Box 771
Jackson, MS 39205-07

Questions