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VISION
To create a world-class educational system that gives students the knowledge and skills to be successful in college and the workforce, and to flourish as parents and citizens

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
Learning Targets

- To review the OSI monitoring process for the following:
  - Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
  - Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
  - Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI)
  - Cohort IV SIG Schools

- To provide context on roles and responsibilities of the school district/school administration for both fiscal and programmatic of plan implementation
The Office of School Improvement Programmatic and Fiscal Monitoring provides oversight of the Title I – 1003 formula grant and the School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003g funds to ensure compliance with:

- Federal and state laws
- Regulations
- Regulatory guidance
Monitoring may be implemented through the following methods:

- On-site review
- Virtual review
- Desk review
On-site and/or Virtual Monitoring Review:

- The process by which selected districts and/or schools receive an on-site (face-to-face) or virtual review from a monitoring team.

Desk Monitoring Review:

- Comprehensive documentation review of the following:
  - Specifically requested fiscal and program implementation artifacts
***Important***

Some of the content provided in this PowerPoint presentation has been adapted from the Office of Federal Programs and the Office of Grants Management process to reflect the expectations for both the Title I 1003 and the School Improvement Grant (SIG) fiscal monitoring process.
FY20 MONITORING

FISCAL
FY20 Fiscal Monitoring Overview

Will include the following:

- Review of documentation from the 2018-2019 school year (continuation from Spring 2020 based on COVID stoppage).
  - Fiscal Compliance
  - Plan Implementation
The MDE Office of School Improvement

- The Office of School Improvement will contact LEA/Subgrantee to:
  a. notify them of the monitoring, and
  b. establish a Primary Point of Contact for monitoring

- The LEA/Subgrantee’s Primary Point of Contact is responsible for gathering and uploading **documents to support each applicable compliance indicator**. Documents may include a word document, pdf document, or word document containing a link to the specific policies and/or procedures online. **Documents must be uploaded to the LEA document library in MCAPS** by the specified date.
The LEA Monitoring Team may consist of the Federal Programs Director, Business Manager, SIG Officer, and other fiscal personnel (bookkeepers, accountants, etc.) and all should be available for the entire two-day (2) monitoring review.

Due to COVID-19, the review will be virtual (the meeting link will be provided to the primary point of contact).

The review will begin with an entrance interview with all members of the LEA Monitoring Team. All programs staff involved in monitoring must be accessible during the monitoring review.
• The 1003 review and the SIG fiscal review will be conducted concurrently with OFP/OGM monitoring, as possible, depending upon the scope of the review.

• The fiscal review will be conducted at the same time as the review from OFP/OGM.
  **Note: If the SIG district has been scheduled for monitoring by the OFP/OGM.

• **SIG Programmatic Monitoring** is always conducted in April
During the two (2) day review, the MDE team will review evidence of implementation, other supporting program documents, and interview the LEA staff and other stakeholders, as applicable.
LEA Financial Department

- Ensure last approved budget is in the LEA account system
- Collaborate on a regular basis to monitor drawdowns, allowable expenditures, and grant funded staff
- Ensure accuracy of grant funded fixed assets
Fixed Assets

- Ensure a complete asset check is current and available
- Ensure documentation of missing, stolen equipment is on file
Fixed Assets – Virtual Review

Evidence of Fixed Assets

- Confirm the appropriate personnel are available and scheduled for the review/verification of equipment
- Provide OSI staff with a current, detailed equipment list (tentative process):
  - Assigned staff will perform a virtual tour of selected schools and or classrooms
  - Assigned staff will be required to see the actual fixed asset virtually in real time (This may be done via iPad and/or a computer software programs such as TEAMS and/or ZOOM)
- Each fixed asset will be verified by observing the following:
  - device
  - equipment tags
  - original serial number
LEA Federal Programs Department

- Review current monitoring document
- Discuss responsibilities and organization of monitoring process with relevant district personnel
- Gather and organize documents for upload and prepare on-site document folders, as applicable
Districts to be Monitored
Districts to Be Monitored - Fall 2020

1. Clarksdale
2. Cleveland
3. Greenwood-Leflore
4. Jackson Public Schools
5. Jefferson County
6. Lee County
7. Madison County
8. North Bolivar
9. Noxubee County
10. Pascagoula-Gautier
11. Pontotoc County
12. South Pike
13. Vicksburg Warren
14. Tate County

Criteria Used to Select Districts:

- Scheduled to be monitored by OFP/OGM 2018-19 (originally from February – June 2020)
- Multiple CSI Identified Schools
- Cohort IV School Improvement Grant (SIG) Schools
- 1003 implementation will also be monitored in SIG districts that have CSI, TSI, or ATSI schools
Districts to Be Monitored – Spring 2021

1. North Panola - SIG
2. MS Achievement School District - SIG
3. Quitman County - SIG

Other Identified Schools - TBD

Criteria Used to Select Districts:

✓ Multiple CSI Identified Schools
✓ Cohort IV School Improvement Grant (SIG) Schools
✓ 1003 Implementation will also be monitored in SIG districts that have CSI, TSI, or ATSI schools
Upload Process

Documentation

Artifacts/Evidence
The LEA will use MCAPS to upload monitoring documents in appropriate FY 20 folders.
Document Upload

- Select appropriate folder to upload documents
Document Upload

• Select “Edit Documents”
Document Upload

- Select the Indicator Document Template

[Image of a screenshot showing a document upload interface with fields for Document Name, Folder Hierarchy, Upload Begin Date, Upload End Date, Minimum Required Count, Maximum Allowed Count, and Document Template.]
• Complete the Indicator Document Template

- Name of document for corresponding indicator (include specific reference if applicable)
- Include a link to the LEA’s policies/procedures online if applicable
• Upload Template Document (e.g. F. Equipment Management Cover Page)
Document Upload

• Continue to upload documents according to indicator cover page
Name the document by indicator and description (e.g. A1. Purchasing Procedure)

If multiple indicators require the same document, then upload the document once, and refer back to the document on the indicator cover page (e.g. See Folder C, Indicator C2)
“The more you give, the more we know.”

- Upload documents specific to indicator
- Upload LEA’s policy and/or LEA’s procedure
- Highlights and reference notes are acceptable
All federal programs will monitor the following fiscal indicators:

A. Accounting Systems and Fiscal Controls
B. Period of Availability
C. Audit Requirements
D. Internal Controls
E. Records and Information Management
F. Equipment Management
G. Personnel
H. Procurement
All federal programs will monitor the following fiscal indicators:

- Indirect Cost
- Budget and Activities
- Allocations
- Equitable Services *(N/A for School Improvement)*
- Data Quality
- General Fiscal Requirements
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

PROGRAMMATIC INDICATORS
1003g (SIG)
Monitored during the Spring of each Year

Process for monitoring will be addressed in a separate meeting with specified personnel from the 5 districts with SIG schools.
All office of school improvement programs will monitor the following programmatic indicators:

SS. Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
TT. Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
UU. Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI)
• The LEA will use MCAPS to upload monitoring documents in appropriate FY20 folders
Select appropriate folder to upload documents

- LL. Title I, Part D Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk
- MM. Title II Supporting Effective Instruction
- NN. Title III EL and Immigrant
- OO. Title IV Student Support and Academic Enrichment
- PP. 21st Century Community Learning Centers
- QQ. Title V Rural and Low-Income Schools
- RR. Title IX McKinney-Vento Homeless Subgrantees
- Corrective Action
- SS Title I School Improvement - Comprehensive Support & Improvement
- TT Title I School Improvement - Targeted Support & Improvement
- UU Title I School Improvement - Additional Support & Improvement
- No Prohibition of Prayer
- Restart Program
- Schools At Risk
- School Improvement Documentation
- Schools Not Meeting AMOs
- SNS
- Title I, Part D - Neglected and Delinquent
- Title III, Part A - English Language Learners
• Select “Edit Documents”
Complete the Indicator Document Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator #</th>
<th>Items Uploaded</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS.1</td>
<td>SS.1 Name file</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Name of document for corresponding indicator (include specific reference if applicable)
- Include a link to the LEA’s policies/procedures online if applicable
Upload Template Document (e.g. SS. Comprehensive Support and Improvement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS Title I School Improvement - Comprehensive Support &amp; Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Folder Hierarchy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 Monitoring SS Title I School Improvement - Comprehensive Support &amp; Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upload Begin Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upload End Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Required Count</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Allowed Count</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Create Link
Upload Document

Documents/Links
Name the document by indicator and description (e.g. SS. Comprehensive Support and Improvement)

If multiple indicators require the same document, then upload the document once, and refer back to the document on the indicator cover page (e.g. See Folder SS., Indicator SS.1)
Notification
Notification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)</th>
<th>Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)</th>
<th>Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Local Education Agency (LEA), School, and Parents have been informed of schools that have been identified based on the following criteria:  
• the school has a graduation rate less than or equal to 67%;  
• the school has been ranked in the bottom 5% of Title I-A schools; or  
• the school has been previously identified as an Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) school with three consecutive years of subgroup performance at or below that of all students in the bottom 5% of Title I-A schools (the third criteria for identification will begin with the 2021-22 school year). (Sec. 1111(D)(c)(i) (I) (II) (III)) | Local Education Agency (LEA), School, and Parents have been informed of schools that have been identified based on the following criteria:  
• the school has one or more subgroups with performance in the lowest 50% of the overall accountability index;  
• the school has one or more subgroups with performance in the lowest quartile of the 3-year average gap-to-goal;  
• the school has one or more subgroups with performance scores in the lowest quartile of the 3-year improvement towards the gap-to-goal closure; and  
• the school has one or more subgroups in the bottom 5% of the eligible, rank-ordered subgroups identified through steps one, two, and three of this criteria. (Sec. 1111(d)(2)(A), (MS Consolidated State Plan) | Local Education Agency (LEA), School, and Parents have been informed of schools that have been identified based on the following criteria:  
• the school has one or more schools with a 3-year subgroup average performance that is at or below that of all students in the lowest-performing Title I-A schools. (Sec. 1111(d)(2)(A), (MS Consolidated State Plan) |
Evidence of Program Implementation:

- Documentation supporting the State Education Agency (SEA) notified the LEA of the schools’ identification status
- Documentation supporting the LEA notified the parents of the school’s identification status
  (*Documentation of the dated notification disseminated to the parent may have been sent by the school)

Question:

- Is there evidence that after receiving notification of the school’s status, the school provided notification of the school’s status to parents of each child enrolled, and the notices contained the following information?
  - School Status
  - Reason(s) for Identification
LEA Board Approved Plan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)</th>
<th>Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)</th>
<th>Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Local Education Agency (LEA) has an approved plan informed by the reason for identification based on the following criteria:  
• the school has a graduation rate less than or equal to 67%;  
• the school has been ranked in the bottom 5% of Title I-A schools; or  
• the school has been previously identified as an Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) school with three consecutive years of subgroup performance at or below that of all students in the bottom 5% of Title I-A schools (the third criteria for identification will begin with the 2021-22 school year). (Sec. 1111(D)(c)(i) (I) (II) (III)) | Local Education Agency (LEA) has an approved plan informed by the reason for identification based on the following criteria:  
• the school has one or more subgroups with performance in the lowest 50% of the overall accountability index;  
• the school has one or more subgroups with performance in the lowest quartile of the 3-year average gap-to-goal;  
• the school has one or more subgroups with performance scores in the lowest quartile of the 3-year improvement towards the gap-to-goal closure; and  
• the school has one or more subgroups in the bottom 5% of the eligible, rank-ordered subgroups identified through steps one, two, and three of this criteria. (Sec. 1111(d)(2)(A), (MS Consolidated State Plan) | Local Education Agency (LEA) has an approved plan informed by the reason for identification based on the following criteria:  
• the school has one or more schools with a 3-year subgroup average performance that is at or below that of all students in the lowest-performing Title I-A schools. (Sec. 1111(d)(2)(A), (MS Consolidated State Plan) |
Evidence of Program Implementation:

- LEA School Board approved current CSI, TSI, or ATSI Plan (Approval Signature Page).
- LEA School Board approved Title I 1003 Funding Application – signed page uploaded in the Related Documents section of the Mississippi Comprehensive Automated Performance-Based System (MCAPS).

Question:

- Does each school identified as CSI, TSI, or ATSI have both a current plan and a Title I 1003 application approved by the LEA school board?

  ✓ Approved School Plan
  ✓ Approved MCAPS Funding Application
Selection of Evidence-Based Interventions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of Program Implementation</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documentation supporting the inclusion of evidence based intensive interventions, strategies, or activities (i.e., leadership, high quality instructional materials, technology integration, on-going, job-embedded professional development, increased learning time, early childhood (Pre-K) programs, or other as identified in the application)</td>
<td>❑ Does each CSI, TSI, or ATSI plan include one or more Evidence-Based Interventions? ❑ Is the plan implemented as approved and do activities supported with 1003 funds meet the <strong>strong, moderate, or promising levels of evidence</strong> as defined under ESSA?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stakeholder Engagement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of Program Implementation</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>❑ Evidence of outreach to stakeholders (for example, emails, web notifications, meeting notes, if applicable, surveys, etc.)</td>
<td>❑ How did the district partner with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers, and parents) in developing the CSI, TSI, or ATSI plan(s)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development of the Plan
## Development of the Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of Program Implementation</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ❑ Documentation supporting the plan(s) was/were developed by the district in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers, and parents), and was it developed through the comprehensive needs assessment process | ❑ Is there evidence supporting the development of the CSI, TSI, or ATSI plan(s) by the district/school?  
✔ Copy of documented meetings agendas, sign-in sheets, and minutes |
Implementation of the Plan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of Program Implementation</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Documentation supporting the implementation of the plan(s) (i.e., interventions, activities, or strategies) | - How does the LEA ensure schools are implementing plans?  
- What support does the LEA provide to CSI, TSI, or ATSI schools?  
- Have there been any challenges in implementing plan(s)? If so, what are they and have adjustments been made?  
- Are there indications that outcomes are improving for students (MAAP, Interim Assessment Data, etc.)? |
TSI & ATSI Specific Indicators
### Evidence of Implementation: Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

- Documentation the **TSI school** plan(s) was/were based on the accountability indicators
- Documentation each school’s TSI plan(s) address the subgroup(s) that is/are **under-performing**
- Evidence the TSI schools are implementing their approved plans (i.e., documentation showing schools carried out the activities described in their plan)

### Evidence of Implementation: Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI)

- Documentation the **ATSI school** plan(s) was/were based on the accountability indicators
- Documentation each school’s ATSI plan address the subgroup(s) that is/are **low-performing**
- Evidence the ATSI schools are implementing their plans (i.e., documentation showing schools carried out the activities described in their plan)

### Question:

- How did ATSI schools consider all the indicators in Mississippi’s accountability system to inform their TSI and ATSI plans?
LEA Monitoring of Plan Implementation
### LEA Monitoring of Plan Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of Program Implementation</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>❑ Documentation that the LEA monitors records (i.e., correspondence with schools, reports (if relevant), data reviewed, notes from school reviews, etc.)</td>
<td>❑ How does the LEA monitor the implementation of the CSI, TSI, or ATSI plan(s)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2020 MS Public School Accountability Standard 12, 12.1, 12.2 (P-16 Council)
12. There is an organized system to encourage community involvement, parental communication, and business partnerships in school district decision-making. (MS Code § 37-7-337) (Districts meeting the Highest Levels of Performance are exempted.)

12.1 A school district that has been designated as Failing (F) as defined by the State Board of Education shall establish a community-based pre-kindergarten through higher education (P-16) council. (Miss. Code Ann. § 37-18-5(4))

12.2 A district and/or a school designated as a D or F shall establish a community-based pre-kindergarten through higher education (P-16) council.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of Program Implementation</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ❑ Documentation of Initiators’ Meeting and Community Council meetings (agendas, sign-in sheets, minutes, etc.) | ❑ Is there evidence that each CSI, TSI, or ATSI school “rated below C” has established a Pre-Kindergarten through higher education Community Engagement Council that meets consistently and actively participates in the implementation of the school’s Plan (District or School Level)?
Utilization of Funds
# Utilization of Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of Program Implementation</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CFPA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local use of funds - CSI, TSI or ATSI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑ Documentation of evidence in the Consolidated Federal Programs Application (CFPA) that the school reserved 20% of its allocation (see Program Details) in CFPA for school improvement activities</td>
<td>❑ Is the school a Title I school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑ Documentation of budgeted evidence-based interventions in the MCAPS budget (Required 20% reservation from Consolidated Application)</td>
<td>❑ Has the school reserved and expended the funds as approved in the CFPA (Required 20% reservation the schools Title I Allocation)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Utilization of Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of Program Implementation</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1003 Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local use of funds - CSI, TSI, or ATSI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑ Documentation of evidence that the school’s 1003 funds were expended in accordance with their approved plan</td>
<td>❑ Did the school expend the 1003 funds in accordance with the approved 1003 funding application expenditures?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑ Were funds obligated and liquidated within the period of availability?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMON MONITORING
FINDINGS
Lack of written policies and/or procedures
  • May not be a simple restatement of law

Lack of implementation of written policies and/or procedures (LEAs not following their own written policies and/or procedures)
  • Insufficient evidence of implementation
Common Monitoring Findings

- Incomplete procurement packets
- Lack of competitive processes (e.g., 2\textsuperscript{nd} quotes, competitive bids)
- Excessive use of Sole Source letter
- Lack of segregation of duties
- Improper documentation of lost/stolen equipment
- Expenditures exceed approved budget (overbudget)
Did not submit policy and/or procedure?

The submitted policy and/or procedure lacked required elements

Did not implement policy and/or procedure as written
Documents and Forms

OSI Program Monitoring Guidance Documentation

- FY20 OSI Monitoring Tool (PDF)
- 2019 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Interview Template (PowerPoint)
- Monitoring Implementation Plan (Word) (PDF) (PDF Writeable)

Revision Procedures

- 1003g School Improvement Grant (SIG) Application not in MCAPS (Guidance Document) (Form)
- 1003 Application in MCAPS (Guidance Document) (Form)

School Board Monthly Update 2020-2021 (Word) (PDF) (PDF Writeable) NEW

School Board Monthly Update 2019-2020 (Sample Guidance Document) (Word) (PDF) (PDF Writeable)

Schools At-Risk (SAR) 2019-2020 Action Plan (Word) (PDF) (PDF Writeable)

MCAPS 1003 Application Guidance

- Supporting Schools Through MCAPS; 1003 Funding Application Process (PowerPoint)
- FY21 MCAPS Guidance Document (PDF) NEW
- FY20 MCAPS Guidance Document (PDF)
- Indicators of Effective Practice Checklist (PDF)
- FY20 and FY21 MCAPS Evidence-based Action Plan (Sample)
- OSI MCAPS District Contact (PDF)

Parent Notification Letter (Word)

School Improvement

- 601-399-1003
- Staff
- FAQ

Services

- Evidence-Based Programs
- Mississippi Instructional Materials Matter
- Revision Request
- School Improvement

Links

- COVID-19 Frequently Asked Questions
- School Improvement Identifications
- School Improvement 1003 Allocations
- MCAPS District Contact List
- Conferences
- Mississippi Succeeds Plan
- Chronic Absenteeism
- Virtual Meetings
- Cohort IV - SIG Competition
- School Improvement Grants (SIG) Information Center 1003 (g)

Resources

- Comprehensive and Targeted School Improvement Schools
- OSI Quick Reference
MONITORING TOOL LINK

“FY20 OSI Program Monitoring Tool”
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