

OFFICE OF INSTRUCTIONAL ENHANCEMENT AND INTERNAL OPERATIONS
Summary of State Board of Education Agenda Items
September 13-14, 2012

OFFICE OF INSTRUCTIONAL ENHANCEMENT AND INTERNAL OPERATIONS

05. Approval of the ESEA Flexibility Request, Principle 2, Differentiated Accountability as a final rule
(Has cleared the Administrative Procedures Act process with public comments)

Executive Summary

On July 20, 2012, the State Board of Education granted approval to begin the Administrative Procedures Act process to include Principle 2 of Mississippi's *ESEA Flexibility Request* to be effective immediately with the 2012 Accountability Results, based on a finding that the rule only confers a benefit and removes a restriction for the public or some segment thereof. Principle 2 of Mississippi's *ESEA Flexibility Request* will be an addendum to the *Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, 2010*.

Recommendation: Approval

Back-up material attached

From: Jack Linton [jack.linton@petalschools.com]
Sent: Friday, August 31, 2012 3:55 PM
To: Accountability
Cc: John A. Buchanan; Renee Evans
Subject: APA Response

To Whom it May Concern:

In response to your request for public response to the proposed change to the Federal Accountability Workbook, our district has several concerns that we feel are important to bring to the MDE's attention.

Lack of Timely Information to Districts

Although, we agree that it is important to adjust or change certain provisions of No Child Left Behind, we are concerned that we were for the most part unaware how some of the provisions of the final approved waiver would affect our school district. We are even more concerned we did not have the opportunity to review how the potential changes would impact our district until after the model was completed for this school year.

It would have been good if we could have taken a similar approach to the one taken by Alabama. Alabama's approach allowed them to "freeze" NCLB requirements for this year and apply for the waiver within a time-measured framework, which allowed for input from the school districts. This gave them the advantage of being able to apply for the waiver, run the approved model and see the results a year in advance of the model taking effect.

New QDI Measures

The addition of the QDI Overall, QDI High, and QDI Low seems to be an additional burden that will be placed on school districts. Since school districts already have a district QDI as well as a per school QDI, it appears that adding new ones will be introducing a layer of unneeded accountability. This will be difficult to manage, and since common core is being implemented soon, is this something that will only be in effect for a year or so?

Also, there are different subject areas on the state and federal models? How will they compare, or will they need to? This represents a great deal more work for something that may or may not benefit districts.

The New Minimum N-Count of 30 Students is Problematic for Mississippi School Districts

The method for N-Count has never been fully explained to district administrators. Enrollment in Mississippi school districts range from less than 800 to over 30,000 and the picking of an arbitrary number has never been divulged to those of us who must attempt to decipher this information and explain it to our parents, teachers, administrators, boards, and communities. Many of us have asked if a percentage would be a more equitable method for all school districts in Mississippi. Some schools districts will never meet the 30 or 40 N-Count while other school districts will always meet the N-Count. Is this process fair to all? The 30 N-Count creates a problem for many school districts in Mississippi. In Mississippi an N-Count of 40 has been the gold standard for determining if a subgroup's proficiency index will be calculated. Changing this N-Count without consulting or notifying school districts until after the school year is over is unfair. If the goal of lowering the N-Count was to ensure additional subgroups were included in the model, by adding QDI-Low to the Federal Model, MDE asserted to the US Department of Education that they accomplished this goal. Why add both?

The Petal School District feels all three of these are valid points and need to be addressed. Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to express our views.

Jack Linton
Assistant Superintendent
Petal School District
115 Highway 42
Petal, MS 39465

601-545-3002

From: stacey pace [stacey.pace@lamarcountyschools.org]
Sent: Friday, August 31, 2012 4:28 PM
To: Accountability
Subject: Federal Accountability Model concerns

To Whom it May Concern:

In response to your request for public response to the proposed changes to the Federal Accountability Workbook, Lamar County School District has several concerns that we feel are important to bring to the MDE's attention.

The 30 N-Count creates a problem for many school districts in Mississippi. In Mississippi an N-Count of 40 has been the gold standard for determining if a subgroup's proficiency index will be calculated. Changing this N-Count without consulting or notifying school districts until after the school year is over is unfair. If the goal of lowering the N-Count was to ensure additional subgroups were included in the model, by adding QDI-Low to the Federal Model, MDE asserted to the US Department of Education that they accomplished this goal. Why add both?

MDE, by adding three additional measures of Quality of Distribution Index, added tremendous complexity to the Federal Accountability Model. Not only do Districts have to be concerned about their State QDI for the District and all its Schools, but they have three additional QDI measures to keep track of. The fact that the State model includes different subject areas than the new Federal model creates a level of complexity that is both unneeded and limits understanding of the model.

Thanks again for letting us have an opportunity to express our concerns.

Stacey Pace

--
Stacey Pace, M. Ed., NCC, NCSC
Assistant Superintendent
District Test Coordinator
Lamar County School District

PRINCIPLE 2 OF MISSISSIPPI'S ESEA FLEXIBILITY REQUEST

**APPROVED BY THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
JULY 20, 2012**



**MISSISSIPPI
DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION**

Ensuring a bright future for every child

U.S. Department of Education
Washington, DC 20202

OMB Number: 1810-0708
Expiration Date: March 31, 2012

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0708. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 336 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537.

PRINCIPLE 2: STATE-DEVELOPED DIFFERENTIATED RECOGNITION, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND SUPPORT

2.A DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT A STATE-BASED SYSTEM OF DIFFERENTIATED RECOGNITION, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND SUPPORT

2.A.i *Provide a description of the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system that includes all the components listed in Principle 2, the SEA's plan for implementation of the differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system no later than the 2012–2013 school year, and an explanation of how the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system is designed to improve student achievement and school performance, close achievement gaps, and increase the quality of instruction for students.*

MDE's accountability system provides differentiated recognition, accountability, and support for all districts in the state and for all Title I schools in those districts based on student achievement, graduation rate, and school performance. The Mississippi plan includes measures to address the achievement gap between the lowest and highest achieving subgroups, as measured by the state's performance assessments, and will be implemented beginning with 2012-13 school year.

MDE is making the Request so that it and its LEAs will no longer be required to make AYP determinations. Instead, MDE and its LEAs will report on their report cards, for the “all students” group and for all subgroups identified in ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v) in each LEA and school, respectively, achievement at each proficiency level, performance against the Annual Measurable Objectives, or AMOs (e.g., “met” or “not met”), participation rate, and graduation rate for high schools or the other academic indicator for elementary and middle schools (which is attendance rate for Mississippi). In addition, MDE and its LEAs will continue to comply with all other reporting requirements in ESEA section 1111(h)(1)(C) and 1111(h)(2)(B), including, for example, reporting information on achievement at each proficiency level disaggregated by gender and migrant status.

MDE, as part of the optional flexibility, will not make an annual AYP determination for its LEAs, and its LEAs would not need to make an annual determination for their schools. In addition, any element of ESEA flexibility that is linked to making AYP would instead be linked to meeting AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate requirement, and the graduation rate goal or targets for high schools or the attendance rate goal for elementary and middle schools. For example, the definition of “reward schools” provides that “a highest-performing school must be making AYP for the ‘all students’ group and all of its subgroups.” For Mississippi’s model, a highest-performing school must be meeting the AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate requirement, and the graduation rate goal or target for a high school or

the attendance rate goal for an elementary or middle school for the “all students” group.

Testing Participation

Testing participation will be calculated using the methods approved in the current accountability workbook. Those districts with schools which have a testing participation rate less than 95% for all students and each ESEA subgroup are referred to the Commission on School Accreditation for disciplinary action, which could include a loss of accreditation. Last November, the State Superintendent wrote letters to those districts with schools whose testing participation rate was below 95% warning them that they were jeopardizing their accreditation status if this issue was not corrected.

Additionally, to encourage testing participation for all students, the number of students not tested exceeding 5% of the students eligible to be tested will be treated as scoring minimal on the tests not taken when calculating **QDI_o** (QDI Overall). To increase the emphasis on testing participation, the number of students not tested will be treated as an overriding indicator for each ESEA subgroup’s AMO measures: a subgroup’s AMO level is moot if the subgroup participation rate is below 95%—a school must design interventions to address participation or risk loss of autonomy in the budgeting of grant dollars. A document supporting the participation rates for a sample subgroup is included in **Attachment 8a, Appendix 8**.

N-Size

Mississippi will reduce the n-size for accountability purposes to thirty and continue to use an n-size of ten for reporting purposes. This approach balances the need to have an n-size sufficiently high to provide reliability to the accountability system, but provide information to the public on how each ESEA subgroup is performing.

Overview

The proposed Differentiated Accountability (DA) model uses both the scale score distribution for a state assessment and the four defined proficiency levels (Minimal, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced) for the assessment, eschewing the reduction of the student achievement information into crude categories that impede the ability of the models to use sensitive measures of student achievement and growth.

Each student’s scale score is used to determine his/her exact position within the score distribution and to classify students into “highest” and “lowest” performing groups for purposes of accurately assessing achievement gaps.

Each student's assigned proficiency level is incorporated into a formula for calculating each achievement index, based on the full range of proficiency levels and is called a "Quality of Distribution Index" or QDI. A Quality of Distribution Index (QDI) value is calculated using data from the state assessments. The QDI value ranges from 0 (100% of students scoring in the lowest proficiency level on the assessments) to 300 (100% of the students scoring in the highest proficiency level on the assessments). The QDI is based on a relatively simple concept—if more students score in the higher proficiency levels on the test, the distribution of scores is more "positive." No credit is given for students scoring in the Minimal (lowest) proficiency level and the greatest credit is given for students scoring in the Advanced (highest) proficiency level. The QDI value can range from 0 (100% of students scoring Minimal) through 300 (100% scoring Advanced), and is calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{QDI} = (1 \times \% \text{ Basic}) + (2 \times \% \text{ Proficient}) + (3 \times \% \text{ Advanced})$$

The QDI value has been used within the Mississippi Accountability System since the 2008-2009 school year and is known to school and district staff, parents, the public and other stakeholders within Mississippi.

QDI Values used in the DA Model are the following:

QDI Overall (QDI_O) -The QDI value calculated using all of the students within a school, district or state and represents overall achievement (the "all students" group)

QDI High (QDI_H) -The QDI value calculated using only the "Highest Performing Students" within a school, district or state

QDI Low (QDI_L) -The QDI value calculated using only the "Lowest Performing Students" within a school, district or state

QDI Gap (QDI_A) -The QDI value calculated by subtracting the achievement index for the lowest performing students (**QDI_L**) from the achievement index for the highest performing students (**QDI_H**); The **QDI_A** represents a measure of the achievement gap at the school, district, or state levels.

As noted previously, each student's scale score is used to determine his/her exact position within the score distribution and to classify students into "highest" and "lowest" performing groups for purposes of accurately assessing achievement gaps.

The new achievement measures and their use within ESEA Flexibility
Principle 2 (DA)

The four QDI values for each school and district (as well as the state)—along with measures based on the new AMOs—provide all the student achievement information necessary for implementing an accurate and reliable accountability model reflecting the principles established by the ED Request documents.

QDI is necessary for creating the school rankings for identifying Title I schools falling within certain areas of the performance distribution.

In addition to QDI measures for school accountability, MDE will also use, as directed through the ESEA Flexibility Guidance, the graduation rates over a period of three years to identify schools for differentiated accountability levels. Mississippi's current graduation rate uses the ED-approved cohort graduation rate.

MDE will publish graduation rates for each school/LEA with a 12th grade for all students and for each ESEA subgroup. The graduation rates will be calculated using a four-year cohort, as approved in the current state accountability workbook. The results of these calculations will be used to determine interventions.

The graduation rate objectives currently approved by the Department of Education will be the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for each LEA and school for all students. A high school or LEA can meet the graduation rate AMO in 3 ways: 1) Meet or exceed the annual graduation rate AMO for the 4-year cohort graduation rate; 2) meet or exceed graduation rate AMO for the 5-year cohort; or 3) the 4-year cohort is 10% greater than the previous year.

<i>Mississippi Graduation Rate AMOs</i>		
Year	4-Year Cohort Graduation Rate	5-Year Cohort Graduation Rate
2010-2011 (AYP Calculations, Fall, 2012)	66%	68%
2011-2012 (AYP Calculations, Fall, 2013)	66%	68%
2012-2013 (AYP Calculations, Fall, 2014)	71%	73%
2013-2014 (AYP Calculations, Fall, 2015)	71%	73%
2014-2015 (AYP Calculations, Fall, 2016)	77%	79%
2015-2016 (AYP Calculations, Fall, 2017)	77%	79%
2016-2017 (AYP Calculations, Fall, 2018)	81%	83%
2017-2018 (AYP Calculations, Fall, 2019)	85%	85%

MDE will ensure interventions are in place for schools that fail to meet the graduation rate targets (known as the Other Academic Indicator, or OAI),

not only for the ALL subgroup, but also for each of the traditional ESEA subgroups, for two consecutive years.

Combining additional accurate and reliable information (e.g., graduation rates) with the achievement information (overall achievement improvement and closing achievement gaps) allows the assignment of Title I schools to the categories specified and defined in the ED Request documents. MDE is still exploring a valid student growth model for use in the DA system and for use in the educator evaluations discussed in Principle 3.

Characteristics of the Proposed Model

The proposed model complies fully with the following requirements for ESEA flexibility approval.

- (1) The proposed system represents a fair, flexible, and focused accountability and support system with incentives for continuously improving the academic achievement of all students, closing persistent achievement gaps, and improving equity.
- (2) The proposed system of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support ... looks at student achievement in ... reading/language arts and mathematics for all students and [for the students in] all subgroups ... identified in ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); graduation rates for all students and [for the students in] all subgroups; and school performance and progress over time, including the performance and progress of [the students in] all subgroups.
- (3) The proposed amendment to the state's AYP model sets new ambitious but achievable AMOs in ... reading/language arts and mathematics for the State and all [districts], [all] schools, and [all of the students in all] subgroups, that provide meaningful goals and are used to guide support and improvement efforts.
- (4) The proposed amendment to the state's AYP model includes an algorithm (similar to that used in the state's currently approved AYP model) that ensures that proficient and advanced scores of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities (SCD) based on alternate academic achievement standards included for AYP proficiency calculations do not exceed 1% of all students in the grades assessed within a district.
- (5) The proposed system of Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support includes appropriate and statistically valid measures of student achievement (and cohort graduation rates) that allow for reliable and accurate classifications of Title I schools as:
 - a) Reward Schools
 - b) Priority Schools
 - c) Focus Schools
 - d) Other Title I schools not making progress in improving student achievement and narrowing achievement gaps, based on the State's new AMOs and other measures

- (6) While the proposed system of Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support includes all of the specific [required] components, the system was designed to incorporate innovative characteristics that are tailored to the needs of the state, [districts], schools, and students. The proposed DA system is designed to improve student achievement, close achievement gaps ... and support continuous improvement for all schools.
- (7) The state's annual [NCLB] report card will be revised to delete information related to "Title I Improvement Status" (based on NCLB §1116) and add the DA School Category (Reward School, Focus School, Priority School).
- (8) Reward Schools, Focus Schools, and Priority Schools under the proposed DA system will be identified (using achievement and graduation data from SY 2010-2011 and earlier years) and the list of identified schools will be included in the state's waiver request.
- (9) The proposed system of Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support will take into account student growth using the state's high-quality assessments. *The student level growth model is currently under development in coordination with the educator evaluation systems, and should be fully implemented by August 2014. Once the educator evaluation system growth model used for proficiency is developed, the plan will be additionally submitted to the ED for further peer review.*

Ensuring Improvement for Students in all ESEA Subgroups

It is possible to ensure that students in each ESEA subgroup make progress and that the achievement gaps among students in those subgroups are closed without actually including all of the separate subgroups within an accountability model. The proposed DA system outlined in the Mississippi Statewide Accountability Technical Document (**Attachment 8a**) uses sensitive and reliable measures of student achievement and reliable measures of school and district level achievement within a contrasting achievement group paradigm to meet the NCLB goal of ensuring that students in each subgroup make progress and that the achievement gaps among students in those subgroups are closed.

Mississippi's accountability system requires an n-count of 40 for data to be included in a given subgroup, as supported by research. Under the old AYP model, 74% of the schools in Mississippi were not held accountable for the IEP subgroup, due to having an n-count fewer than 40; likewise, 98% of the schools were not held accountable for the EL subgroup. Under the proposed model only 2% of schools would have fewer than 40 students in the "lowest performing" subgroup (0.4% of the lowest performing students). See **Attachment 8a** for more data on this issue.

Accountability for Individual ESEA Subgroups

The Mississippi model of a low performing subgroup (QDI-Low) increases the accountability for the traditional ESEA subgroups. The Mississippi school system is predominately a rural school system with many small schools. For the 2010-11 school year, the median school size was 257 students, and the average size was 310 students. At an n-count of 30, 95% or more of the schools will not be accountable for the following ESEA subgroups:

- Limited English Proficient (or English Learners/EL)
- Asian
- Hispanic
- Native American

Even at an n-count of 20, the percent of schools not held accountable for these subgroups is still 90% or more.

As noted above, using the former n-count of forty, 76% of schools in the state were not held accountable for the IEP subgroup in the 2010-11 school year. Using the new n-count of thirty, the number of schools not held accountable for IEP students would have been 59%. The lowest 25% subgroup will provide more accountability for the IEP subgroup.

As further documentation, the table below shows the schools whose n-count is less than 30, too small for accountability for the individual IEP subgroup. However, all of these schools have IEP students within their QDI-Low, and will thus be held accountable for subgroup performance. The table represents the number of schools whose percentage falls within the range indicated for the QDI-Low subgroup. The range indicates the percentage of IEP scores in the lowest subgroup.

Percent of IEP scores in QDI-Low		
Range		Number of Schools
>	<=	
0	5	13
5	10	44
10	15	99
15	20	134
20	25	103
25	30	56
30	35	30
35	40	23
40	45	6
45	50	3
50	55	1
55	60	1
60	65	0
65	70	2

As the IEP subgroup becomes a larger percentage of the lowest 25%, it becomes difficult if not impossible to improve the lowest subgroup without improving the results of the IEP subgroup. This effectively increases the number of schools held accountable. The subgroup structure indicating the group size for each ESEA subgroup in the QDI-Low is provided in **Attachment 8a, Appendix 10.**

Creating Incentives for Improvement

The Mississippi QDI model incentivizes schools to move students to the next level regardless of their current level and penalizes schools that allow a student's proficiency level to drop. In the Mississippi model, the school gets as much credit for moving a student from minimal to basic as for moving a student from basic to proficient. Likewise, if a student slides from basic to minimal, the school loses as much as a student sliding from advanced to proficient.

Increasing the percentage of students at Basic, Proficient and Advanced provides the same increase in QDI (a 1 percent increase, increases QDI by 1):

- Minimal (weight of 0) to Basic (weight of 1) is an increase of one
- Basic (weight of 1) to Proficient (weight of 2) is an increase of one
- Proficient (weight of 2) to Advanced (weight of 3) is an increase of one

The reverse is also true: allowing students to fall down an achievement level penalizes the school regardless of the resulting level. If a school becomes complacent with its advanced students and scores slip into proficient levels, then the school's QDI will be lowered.

A system that only awards equal points to performance at proficient or above incentivizes schools to concentrate on those students at the basic level and ignore the other students. Moving students from basic to proficient would have more impact than moving students from minimal to basic. If the weighting for proficient and advanced is the same, then there is no incentive to move a student from proficient to advanced or no consequence if a student moves down from advanced to proficient.

Example: The following tables show the effect of moving a student between levels. The baseline QDI (**Table 1**) in this example is 150.

Table 1: Baseline	Minimal	Basic	Proficient	Advanced	Total
Number of Students	10	10	10	10	40
Percent	25	25	25	25	100
Weighting	0	1	2	3	
QDI	0	25	50	75	150

When a student moves from Minimal to Basic (**Table 2**) or Basic to Proficient (**Table 3**), the school's QDI increases to 153 (the same increase in QDI).

Table 2: Move Student from Minimal

	Minimal	Basic	Proficient	Advanced	Total
Number of Students	9	11	10	10	40
Percent	22.5	27.5	25	25	100
Weighting	0	1	2	3	
QDI	0	27.5	50	75	153

Table 3: Move Student from Basic to Proficient

	Minimal	Basic	Proficient	Advanced	Total
Number of Students	10	9	11	10	40
Percent	25	22.5	27.5	25	100
Weighting	0	1	2	3	
QDI	0	22.5	55	75	153

When a student moves from Basic to Minimal (**Table 4**) or Advanced to Proficient (**Table 5**), the school's QDI decreases to 148 (the same decrease).

Table 4: Student falls from Basic to Minimal

	Minimal	Basic	Proficient	Advanced	Total
Number of Students	11	9	10	10	40
Percent	27.5	22.5	25	25	100
Weighting	0	1	2	3	
QDI	0	22.5	50	75	148

Table 5: Student falls from Advanced to Proficient

	Minimal	Basic	Proficient	Advanced	Total
Number of Students	10	10	11	9	40
Percent	25	25	27.5	22.5	100
Weighting	0	1	2	3	
QDI	0	25	55	67.5	148

The increase and decrease in QDI is not identical, because of rounding. (The unrounded results show an identical increase/decrease of 2.5 points.) As this example shows, the movement of a student has the same impact to the school, regardless of the levels involved.

Under the proposed system, “Quality of Distribution Index” (QDI) values are calculated for the overall achievement at the school, district, or state (**QDI_O**), the achievement of the “Lowest Performing Students” (**QDI_L**), and the achievement of the “Highest Performing Students” (**QDI_H**). A measure of the achievement gap at the school, district, or state (**QDI_Δ**) is calculated by subtracting the achievement index for the lowest performing students (**QDI_L**) from the achievement index for the highest performing students (**QDI_H**).

Separate sets of QDI values are calculated for the current school year and for several earlier school years. Once the QDI values have been calculated, they are used for making determinations and for identifying schools under the DA system using the steps described on the following pages.

As shown in **Attachment 8a**, schools and districts must improve overall student performance and close the achievement gaps between the highest and lowest performing students (including the performance of students in all ESEA subgroups) in order to reach the AMO goal. If students in some of the ESEA subgroups are allowed to perform poorly, the achievement gap cannot be closed and the “lowest performing students” subgroup will not reach the AMO goal.

Although the proposed amended DA model incorporates only two achievement subgroups to accomplish the goals of closing achievement gaps and ensuring improved performance of the students in all ESEA subgroups, supplemental analyses will be run to determine the percentages of students in each ESEA subgroup with scores in the high and low contrasting achievement subgroups. Interventions for each subgroup not performing will be established for each school.

In summary, the proposed model is designed to improve student achievement, close achievement gaps and support continuous improvement for all schools.

Mississippi’s differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system creates incentives and provides support to close achievement gaps for all subgroups of students.

Incentives:

To actively encourage schools to close achievement gaps for all subgroups of students, MDE plans to recognize schools that reach Reward status. While financial incentives are desirable, due to current economic and fiscal restraints, MDE is pursuing other avenues of recognition, including banners, recognition at board meetings, designations noted on the website and/or included in a publication, staff serving on councils of excellence,

flexibility on some state requirements, and other areas of encouragement, as identified by district personnel, which may include additional funds as available. MDE is actively working with school and district personnel, through focus groups and on-line surveys, to identify additional supports and incentives. Further, information will be gathered through research such as the *Closing the Expectations Gap* annual report from Achieve, Inc.

Current state accountability procedures include incentives for overall school performance. Section 4 of the *Mississippi Public School Accountability Standards, 2010* includes the following items on recognition and rewards that incentivize schools and districts to improve:

4.0 RECOGNITION AND REWARDS

The SBE shall provide special recognition and/or rewards to individual schools or school districts meeting the highest levels of accreditation standards as defined by SBE. A school or district with a QDI in the top two ranges will be identified as meeting the highest level of accreditation standards.

4.1 RECOGNITION

Special recognition will be provided to all schools meeting the highest levels of accreditation standards. Examples of recognition include, but are not limited to the following:

- Public announcements and events;
- Special recognition of student progress and effort;
- Certificates of recognition and plaques for teachers, principals, superintendents, support and classified personnel and parents; and
- Media announcements utilizing the services of the Mississippi Educational Television.

4.2 REWARDS

Rewards may be provided for schools and school districts assigned the highest levels of performance as defined by SBE as follows:

4.2.1 Exemptions for Schools Meeting the Highest Levels of Performance.

Schools meeting the highest levels of performance may be exempted from citations of noncompliance with [certain] process standards.

4.2.2 Exemptions for School Districts Meeting the Highest Levels of Performance.

School districts assigned the highest levels of performance may be exempted from citations of noncompliance with [certain] process standards.

4.2.3 Financial Rewards.

If funds are appropriated by the legislature, schools meeting the highest levels of performance may apply to SBE for monetary incentives to be used for selected school needs, as identified by a vote of all licensed and instructional personnel employed at the school.

Support:

Mississippi has been working since 2008 towards a structured and coordinated statewide system of support (SSOS). Early efforts involved conducting a thorough evaluation of existing support, identifying gaps for informing strategic planning, exploring a tiered model for district assistance, and collaborating across MDE offices. Due to change in MDE staff and reorganization of the agency in 2010, the work on the SSOS was placed on hold. Just recently, MDE established the Office of Instructional Enhancement to focus on developing and implementing a structured and coordinated statewide system of support. The next step will be to select external stakeholders and MDE representatives to serve on a SSOS Roundtable to determine how to coordinate support services with a unified delivery system. Also recently, MDE conducted a survey of district-level staff to solicit insight and recommendations for how the agency can improve services, reduce duplication, and increase efficiency. Results from the survey will be used to initiate the dialogue with the SSOS Roundtable about areas such as collaborating with offices on deadlines for multiple projects, providing consistency across offices, and improving communication. The SSOS Roundtable will also provide feedback on the best way to provide support for all schools based on needs.

In order to better support the needs of school districts and schools in Focus, Priority, and Reward status, and schools not in the identified school categories, as well as to reduce duplicated services and paperwork burdens, MDE is undergoing another review of the staff, offices, and support mechanisms to realign MDE's capacity and structure to most effectively address gaps, at-risk populations, and "bubble schools" or those near to entering the Focus and Priority status.

One of the key components of flexibility to be garnered through the Request is the ability to leverage funds from a variety of state and federal sources. With approval of the waiver request, MDE plans, as part of the review and realignment noted above, to include Title I, Part A, 1003a, and Consolidated Federal Cost Pool funds to support a streamlined effort of support for schools identified as Priority or Focus. Through the flexibility of coordinated funding, services from MDE will ensure that all schools will receive the support needed to address the needs of all subgroups, including schools that have overall high performance, but lagging scores for one or more subgroups. To reduce duplication and paperwork expectations, offices across MDE will coordinate submissions of plans and district monitoring, including activities from accreditation, federal programs, special education, school improvement, and school recovery, to ensure that support efforts are reaching each subgroup in the state and targeting continuous improvement.

All of these plans and initiatives will continue to be implemented in districts and schools during the 2012-13 school year and beyond.

MDE's Office of Instructional Enhancement is working with SEDL and the Center on Innovation and Improvement (CII) to develop an operations manual for the structured and coordinated SSOS. The operations manual will guide MDE's work by specifying the purpose, mission, and vision of the SSOS. This manual will also indicate the organizational framework of the SSOS and the Cycle of the Support and will specify the functions of MDE to disseminate information, establish standards, develop and disseminate resources, monitor compliance, and provide technical assistance to help schools make improvements and correct any deficient areas. Supports, interventions, and incentives will be provided to schools according to the following tiers: Priority schools, Schools at risk of becoming Priority schools, Focus schools, Other schools not meeting the AMOs but are not a Priority school, Other schools that meet the AMOs but are not a Reward school, and Rewards. School districts that are under conservatorship will also receive support based on the designation of each school as well as additional support from MDE based on the needed areas. The Office of Instructional Enhancement is taking the lead on establishing a coordinated support system. The role of this office is to work with all MDE offices that support MS schools in order to coordinate efforts. This will be done by conducting meetings periodically with agency staff and other stakeholders, establishing a calendar of events to include regional meetings, conferences and technical assistance sessions, monitoring sessions, etc.

MDE is exploring the use of Indistar as a reporting tool for the SSOS through a pilot being conducted in the schools receiving 1003g School Improvement Grant (SIG) funding. The SSOS will include roles and responsibilities of each entity, processes and procedures, and a timeline for delivering services. This information will be helpful to the SEA, school districts, and other partners. A key component of the development of the SSOS Manual and process is the input of a Stakeholders Coordinating Council that will include a school-level view of the supports needed to be in place. A process will be in place for evaluating the SSOS and making adjustments when needed. MDE is planning to utilize a rubric developed by the CII for evaluating and improving the SEA Differentiated System of Recognition, Accountability, and Support (SRAS). See **Attachment 8a1** for the SRAS evaluation rubric. The timeline regarding the development of the coordinated SSOS is included below.

The coordinated SSOS will work to provide resources and services that will help schools improve instructional practice to prepare students for college and career ready standards. MDE offices will continue to work together to develop and disseminate resources and training materials to support all students including low-performing students, students with disabilities, and

ELs. All training will be facilitated through the Regional Education Service Agencies with the delivery of the content provided by MDE content specialists, higher education faculty, and MDE contract workers.

Statewide System of Support (SSOS) Timeline

Key Milestone/Activity	Detailed timeline	Party (Parties) Responsible
1. Establish an Associate Superintendent position to lead SSOS	August 2011	State Superintendent, SBE
2. Begin piloting of Indistar as a SSOS reporting tool in SIG schools	November 2011	Office of School Recovery (SR)
3. Conduct further examination of Indistar	Feb–March 2012	SSOS Core team members
4. Conduct Conference Call with SEDL, CII, and MDE regarding SSOS	March 29, 2012	Office of Instructional Enhancement (IE), CII, SEDL
5. Conduct initial meeting with Core Group and SEDL staff to plan for the development of the coordinated SSOS	May 8, 2012	IE, SSOS Core Group, SEDL
6. Determine other members of MDE staff that need to participate in development of the coordinated SSOS	May 8, 2012	SSOS Core Group & SEDL
7. Identify offices that will take the lead on the tiered support to schools <u>Levels of Support for schools</u> a. Priority b. School at Risk c. Focus d. Other-not meeting AMO but not priority e. Other-meeting AMO but not rewards f. Rewards g. **Conservatorship districts will also receive support according to how each school is designated	May 8, 2012	MDE Office of a. SR b. School Improvement c. Federal Programs d. IE e. IE f. Accountability/ Federal Programs g. Conservatorship
8. Provide an update to MDE Leadership Team about the timeline for developing the SSOS	May 14, 2012	IE
9. Conduct preplanning meeting for the coordinated SSOS operations manual	May 29, 2012	IE, SR, School Improvement, SEDL
10. Conduct meeting with Core Group to develop draft SSOS operations manual	June 11, 2012	SSOS Core Group and SEDL

Key Milestone/Activity	Detailed timeline	Party (Parties) Responsible
11. Convene office staff to develop a plan for coordinating their efforts with departments that provide direct services to districts and schools	July 2, 2012	IE
12. Convene larger group of MDE staff to review the draft coordinated SSOS operations manual and provide feedback.	August 7, 2012	IE
13. Identify schools to determine level of support	August 2012	Accountability, IE, Federal Programs, SR, School Improvement
14. Notify schools of preliminary status	August 2012	Accountability, IE, Federal Programs, SR, School Improvement
15. Train schools on the Indistar system	September 2012	IE, Federal Programs, School Recovery
16. Support schools in completing self-assessment on Indicators, as appropriate for status	September /October 2012	IE, Federal Programs
17. Support schools in utilizing Indistar platform to develop action plans and begin implementation	October 2012	IE, Federal Programs
18. Provide an opportunity for districts and schools, at state meetings and conferences, to provide input on the draft MDE coordinated SSOS operations manual	Fall 2012	IE
19. Convene internal and external stakeholders to provide input around the coordinated SSOS through meetings, webinars, and surveys	Fall 2012	IE
20. Incorporate feedback provided by internal and external stakeholders into SSOS process	December 2012	IE
21. Create supporting documents for the coordinated SSOS and update website to communicate MDE SSOS	January 2013	IE
22. Follow-up with schools to determine progress of interventions and discuss consequences	February 2013	IE, Federal Programs

While the timeline above provides an overview of merging all support into one unified SSOS, MDE offices listed in item 7 will identify, intervene, and support schools as needed to ensure that implementation begins with the 2012-13 school year and to prevent students and schools from falling farther behind in the process of improvement. Detailed timelines are provided in each of the school status areas later in this document.

2.A.ii Select the option that pertains to the SEA and provide the corresponding information, if any.

<p>Option A</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The SEA only includes student achievement on reading/language arts and mathematics assessments in its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system and to identify Reward, Priority, and Focus schools.</p>	<p>Option B</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If the SEA includes student achievement on assessments in addition to reading/language arts and mathematics in its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system or to identify Reward, Priority, and Focus schools, it must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. provide the percentage of students in the “all students” group that performed at the proficient level on the State’s most recent administration of each assessment for all grades assessed; and b. include an explanation of how the included assessments will be weighted in a manner that will result in holding schools accountable for ensuring all students achieve college- and career-ready standards.
--	--

MDE is proposing the inclusion of student achievement on science assessments (currently Biology I and 5th and 8th grade Science) in the Mississippi differentiated accountability system, in addition to reading language arts and mathematics. The table below includes the percentage of students in the “all students” group that performed at each performance level on the 2010-11 administration for each assessment.

2010-2011 Student Level Proficiency Distributions²

Test ¹	N-Count	% Minimal	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced
MCT2 Language	212,463	12.8	33.8	43.6	9.8
MCT2 Math	212,341	14.4	24.3	47.0	14.3
Science Test 5/8	68,073	16.8	27.5	38.2	17.4
English II	32,074	21.0	21.7	39.3	18.0
Algebra I	33,422	6.9	15.5	43.6	34.0
Biology I	32,037	13.6	30.7	45.4	10.3

¹ Test results in this table are collapsed across grades.

² N-Counts and results include students enrolled for a full academic year only.

MDE’s weighting of the included assessments will result in holding schools accountable for ensuring all students achieve the State’s college- and career-ready standards. Given the importance of science, along with all areas of STEM, in a student’s overall educational program, the decision to include state science assessment results in the DA model will

send a strong message: Mississippi makes the right choices for its students. Working with various STEM partnership initiatives, including collaborative efforts between Career and Technical Education, the US Navy, and postsecondary education, Mississippi has set an example following the national focus on STEM. By including science in the on-going focus on assessment and accountability, the state supports the instructional practices that are necessary to take students to the next level of instruction and truly ensures that all students achieve college- and career-ready standards.

The previous page includes the list of assessments Mississippi will use for the differentiated accountability system, and the statewide student level proficiency distributions. For a school's differentiated accountability measure, each assessment is weighted equally in the calculation of QDI. (See **Attachment 8a** for more details.)

Assurance 6 of the ESEA Request is checked, and as it indicates, MDE proposes to include student achievement on science assessments (currently Biology I and 5th and 8th grade Science) in addition to reading/language arts and mathematics in its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system. The achievement on all the assessments will be used to identify Priority, Focus, and Reward schools, and MDE has technical documentation, which can be made available to the Department upon request, demonstrating that the assessments are administered statewide; include all students, by providing appropriate accommodations for ELs and students with disabilities, as well as alternate assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.6(a)(2); and are valid and reliable for use in the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system.

2.B SET AMBITIOUS BUT ACHIEVABLE ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES

Select the method the SEA will use to set new ambitious but achievable annual measurable objectives (AMOs) in at least reading/language arts and mathematics for the State and all LEAs, schools, and subgroups that provide meaningful goals and are used to guide support and improvement efforts. If the SEA sets AMOs that differ by LEA, school, or subgroup, the AMOs for LEAs, schools, or subgroups that are further behind must require greater rates of annual progress.

<p>Option A</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Set AMOs in annual equal increments toward a goal of reducing by half the percentage of students in the “all students” group and in each subgroup who are not proficient within six years. The SEA must use current proficiency rates based on assessments administered in the 2010–2011 school year as the starting point for setting its AMOs.</p> <p>i. Provide the new AMOs and an explanation of the method used to set these AMOs.</p>	<p>Option B</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Set AMOs that increase in annual equal increments and result in 100 percent of students achieving proficiency no later than the end of the 2019–2020 school year. The SEA must use the average statewide proficiency based on assessments administered in the 2010–2011 school year as the starting point for setting its AMOs.</p> <p>i. Provide the new AMOs and an explanation of the method used to set these AMOs.</p>	<p>Option C</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Use another method that is educationally sound and results in ambitious but achievable AMOs for all LEAs, schools, and subgroups.</p> <p>i. Provide the new AMOs and an explanation of the method used to set these AMOs.</p> <p>ii. Provide an educationally sound rationale for the pattern of academic progress reflected in the new AMOs in the text box below.</p> <p>iii. Provide a link to the State’s report card or attach a copy of the average statewide proficiency based on assessments administered in the 2010–2011 school year in reading/language arts and mathematics for the “all students” group and all subgroups. (Attachment 8)</p>
--	--	---

Method for Setting Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)

MDE will set AMOs based on an achievement index. The achievement index is based on statewide assessments in reading/language and math, which yields four achievement levels: Minimal, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. The proficient level is the goal for all students in Mississippi.

The following formula will be used to calculate the Achievement index:

1. Percent of student scoring Basic times 0.5; plus
2. Percent of students scoring Proficient times 1.0; plus
3. Percent of students scoring Advanced times 1.0.

Note: Students scoring Minimal do not contribute to the index.

This total will be rounded to a whole number and be between 0 and 100 for each school, LEA, and the State.

An achievement index will be calculated for all students and each ESEA subgroup for reading/language and math and compared against the annual AMO objective.

Calculation of Annual AMOs

MDE is choosing **Option A** for setting AMOs for the State, LEAs, and schools in the state.

Based on 2010–2011 assessment data, a baseline achievement index will be established for each school, LEA, and State **for all students and each ESEA subgroup, by subject area**. The baseline achievement index will be subtracted from 100. This percentage will be divided in half. This percentage will be divided by 6 to establish annual AMO increase. This methodology will be used to establish separate AMOs for each school, LEA and the State and also ESEA subgroups within each school, LEA, and State.

Example:

State of Mississippi Reading/Language: All Students 2010-2011 Assessment results

- Minimal = 14.1 percent
- Basic = 32.3 percent
- Proficient = 42.8 percent
- Advanced = 10.8 percent

Achievement index calculation

$$(14.1 \times 0.0) + (32.3 \times 0.5) + (42.8 \times 1.0) + (10.8 \times 1.0) = 70 \text{ (round to whole number)}$$

Therefore, the baseline is 70. Subtract from 100 = 30. Divide by 2 = 15.

Divide by 6 = 2.5. Details of the calculations are included in **Attachment 8a**.

Mississippi's Proposed AMOs for the State

The following table provides the proposed annual AMOs for the state.

MDE Proposed AMO (Proficiency Index) Objectives by Subgroup for the State (Option A in Request - Reduce gap by half in 6 years)

Reading/Language(Proficiency Index)								
Subgroup	2011 (Baseline)	Annual Increase	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
ALL	70	2.50	73	75	78	80	83	85
IEP	40	5.00	45	50	55	60	65	70
EL	58	3.50	62	65	69	72	76	79
Economically Disadvantaged	62	3.17	65	68	72	75	78	81
Asian	86	1.17	87	88	90	91	92	93
Black	60	3.33	63	67	70	73	77	80
Hispanic	69	2.58	72	74	77	79	82	85
Native American	69	2.58	72	74	77	79	82	85
White	80	1.67	82	83	85	87	88	90

Math (Proficiency Index)								
Subgroup	2011 (Baseline)	Annual Increase	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
ALL	75	2.08	77	79	81	83	85	88
IEP	45	4.58	50	54	59	63	68	73
EL	72	2.33	74	77	79	81	84	86
Economically Disadvantaged	68	2.67	71	73	76	79	81	84
Asian	93	0.58	94	94	95	95	96	97
Black	66	2.83	69	72	75	77	80	83
Hispanic	78	1.83	80	82	84	85	87	89
Native American	78	1.83	80	82	84	85	87	89
White	83	1.42	84	86	87	89	90	92

As assured in Assurance 14 on page 7, MDE will make determinations for each district and school in the state linked to meeting the AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate requirement, and the graduation rate goal or targets for high schools or the attendance rate goal for elementary and middle schools. For example, a highest-performing school must be meeting the AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate requirement, and the graduation rate goal or target for a high school or the attendance rate goal for an elementary or middle school for the "all students" group.

Purpose of AMOs: Interventions for ESEA Subgroups

AMOs will be used to identify persistently low ESEA subgroups, and those schools with extended low performance will be required to develop and

implement action plans for improving student performance. Schools not meeting AMOs for two consecutive years in the same AMO category (reading language arts, math, or other academic indicator [graduation rate or attendance rate]) must select and implement interventions that address each of the subgroups not meeting annual objectives. After two years of persistently not meeting AMOs, the schools and districts with low performing ESEA subgroups will receive more oversight and direction on intervention selection, implementation, and the overall use of federal dollars to support curriculum.

As an example, the first step of additional oversight for every school district will come through the annually completed Consolidated Federal Programs Application (CFPA) that includes the school district's expenditures for Title I-A and Title II-A of ESEA. The current application includes assurances and strategies for addressing the five goals of NCLB. Upon approval of the ESEA Request, the CFPA will be revised to include assurances and strategies for meeting AMOs as outlined in the ESEA Request. After two years of not meeting AMOs, schools will receive more direction and less flexibility in the selection of strategies and interventions.

Each school will receive a Differentiated Accountability Report that will outline subgroup performance, denoting each subgroup's performance toward the expected AMO and identifying the areas that are low performing.

Communicating the Changes

In an effort to be proactive in accountability communication, MDE has recently added the Office of Accountability Services. This office is responsible for providing training and information both for the local school districts and their communities in every aspect of the Mississippi Accountability System. The Office of Accountability Services along with MDE's Communication Office will be responsible for building a public relations plan with the goal of educating and informing Mississippi communities on the changes involved with the new accountability system and how those changes will affect student performance.

The goal will be to launch the communication or public relations plan in the fall of 2012 during the months of September, October and November. Generally, the public relations plan will include sharing information through regional stakeholder meetings, the use of multiple forms of media (e.g., internet, television, newspapers), regional administrator meetings, and educational service organizations and associations.

2.C REWARD SCHOOLS

2.C.i Describe the SEA's methodology for identifying highest-performing and high-progress schools as Reward schools. If the SEA's methodology is not based on the definition of reward schools in ESEA Flexibility (but instead, e.g. based on school grades or ratings that take into account a number of factors), the SEA should also demonstrate that the list provided is consistent with the definition, per the Department's "Demonstrating that an SEA's Lists of Schools meet ESEA Flexibility Definitions" guidance.

MDE will use the following methodology for identifying highest-performing and high-progress schools as Reward schools, as directed through the ESEA Flexibility Request Documents provided by the ED:

High Performing

1. The QDI-Overall for each of three years must be in the highest 20% of the QDI-Overall for all schools in the State, **AND**
2. The QDI-Low for each of three years must be in the highest 20% of the QDI-Low for all schools in the State, **AND**
3. The graduation rate for the current school year must be in the highest 20% of the graduation rates for all schools in the State, **AND**
4. The school must have met AMOs for the current school year for "all students" and "all subgroups," including participation rates, and graduation/attendance rates for "all students," **AND**
5. The schools QDI-Gap for the current year must be in the lowest 25% of QDI-Gap for all the schools in the State.

High Progress

1. The difference between the QDI-Overall for the current year and the QDI-Overall from two years previous is in the highest 10% of the differences for all schools in the State, **AND**
2. The difference between the 4 year cohort graduation rate for the current year and the 4 year cohort graduation rate from two years previous is in the highest 25% of the differences for all schools in the State, **AND**
3. The school's QDI-Gap for the current year must be in the lowest 25% of QDI-Gap for all the schools in the State or the difference between the current QDI-Gap and the QDI-Gap from two years previous is in the lowest 25% of the differences for all schools in the State. Since the current QDI-Gap should be smaller than the QDI-Gap from two years previous to indicate improvement, a negative value represents closing the gap and positive values represent an increasing gap.

MDE followed the ED's guidance entitled "Demonstrating that an SEA's Lists of Reward, Priority, and Focus Schools Meet ESEA Flexibility Definitions," which includes on pages 1 and 2 in the Definition Summary that the Reward Schools must be Title I schools. MDE

calculates the data for each school, and then rank orders all schools. Schools are selected for Reward based upon the criteria described on the previous page. Mississippi further removes any non-Title I schools from the list, as the ED guidance indicates only Title I schools are eligible for Reward Status.

2.C.ii Provide the SEA's list of Reward schools on page 68.

MDE has provided data to demonstrate that the identified number of schools meet the definition in Attachment 8a, Appendix 7.

2.C.iii Are the recognition and, if applicable, rewards proposed by the SEA for its highest-performing and high-progress schools likely to be considered meaningful by the schools? Has the SEA consulted with the LEAS and schools in designing its recognition and where applicable, rewards?

As noted in response 2.a, MDE, in cooperation with school district practitioners, is developing a statewide recognition and rewards program that will truly incentivize schools to improve and reach Reward status. In addition to the information presented in 2.a regarding the statewide plan for rewarding high performing schools and districts, MDE has a board-approved methodology to provide monetary awards to Title I schools that have significantly closed the achievement gap between the sub-groups of students; or exceeded their AMOs for two or more consecutive years:

- Funding provided based on increase in Title I Part A funding from preceding year (maximum of 5%);
- Generally award twelve schools annually (depending on funding);
- Highest two awarded schools recognized at National Title I Conference; and
- All awarded schools recognized by SBE.

Options for Rewards in **Reward Schools**:

- Recognition at SBE meeting with banners and public recognition via the media (TV, newspaper, website);
- Increased opportunities to serve on task forces, such as Educator Leader Cadre, and assist MDE with the transition and implementation of College and Career Ready Standards and Assessments;
- Post list of reward schools on MDE website;
- Determine best practices and share with other districts at state conferences;
- Serve as a model school that other schools may visit; and
- Exempt school from certain citations of noncompliance with certain state accreditation requirements, as noted in the *Mississippi Public School Accountability Standards* noted below.

4.2.1 Exemptions for Schools Meeting the Highest Levels of

Performance. Schools Meeting the Highest Levels of Performance may be exempted from citations of noncompliance with the process standards listed below.

- Library Media/Organized Collection (Standard 24.1: Each school has a library-media center with an organized collection of materials and equipment that represents a broad range of current learning media, including instructional technology.)
- Library Media Program of Service (Standard 24.2: The library staff offers a systematic program of service to students and staff by providing access to the materials and equipment, by providing instruction in the use of the materials and equipment, and by working with teachers and other staff members to provide learning activities for the students.)
- High School Science Laboratory (Standard 25: The school district provides each student with appropriate equipment and laboratory experiences to meet the instructional requirements of the science program. See the current edition of the Mississippi Science Framework.)
- Limit on Course Preparations (Standard 31: Individual teachers (grades 9-12) are limited to three course preparations per scheduling cycle or five in the same subject/content area.)
- Student Teacher Ratios in Grades 1-4 (Standard 34.2: Student teacher ratios do not exceed 27 to 1 in classrooms serving grades 1 through 4 unless approved by SBE.)
- Limit of 150 Students Per Teacher in Academic Core Subjects (Standard 34.5: The total number of students taught by an individual teacher in academic core subjects at any time during the school year shall not exceed 150.)

4.2.2 Exemptions for Schools Meeting the Highest Levels of

Performance. School districts assigned the Highest Levels of Performance may be exempted from citations of noncompliance with the process standards listed below.

- Community Involvement, Parental Communication, and Business Partnerships (Standard 18: There is an organized system to encourage community involvement, parental communication, and business partnerships in school district decision-making.)
- Senior Preparation for Graduation Ceremonies (Standard 19.5: The school district schedules preparation for graduation ceremonies in such manner that graduating seniors are absent from classes for no more than three days prior to the end of the school year.)
- Summer School Program Requirements (Standard 19.6: The summer school/extended year program meets all applicable requirements of the regular school program. {MS Code 37-3-49})

- Professional Development Plan/Program (Standard 21: The school district implements a professional development program that complies with the guidelines published in Professional Development for the New Millennium.)
- Early Childhood Programs (kindergarten and teacher assistant) (Standard 23.1: The school district is in compliance with state requirements of provisions of subsection (4) of MS Code 37-21-7.)
- Instructional Management System (Standard 27.1: The school district implements an instructional management system that has been adopted by the school board and includes, at a minimum, the competencies and objectives required in the curriculum frameworks approved by SBE.)
- Suggested Teaching Strategies, Resources, and Assessment Strategies (Standard 27.2: Suggested teaching strategies, resources, and assessment strategies are available to teachers in each school for selection and use in teaching the required competencies.)

Please note that while tangible monetary rewards are desirable, MS Code prohibits awarding “bonuses”; however, schools are encouraged to give incentives or additional stipends, as is the case for National Board Certification and other similar programs.

2.D PRIORITY SCHOOLS

2.D.i Describe the SEA's methodology for identifying a number of lowest-performing schools equal to at least five percent of the State's Title I schools as Priority schools. If the SEA's methodology is not based on the definition of priority schools in ESEA Flexibility (but instead, e.g. based on school grades or ratings that take into account a number of factors), the SEA should also demonstrate that the list provided is consistent with the definition, per the Department's "Demonstrating that an SEA's Lists of Schools meet ESEA Flexibility Definitions" guidance.

MDE will use the following methodology for identifying at least five percent of the State's Title I schools as Priority schools:

Per the ESEA Flexibility definition, MDE will identify a Priority School as "a school that, based on the most recent data available, has been identified as among the lowest-performing schools in the State. The total number of Priority schools in a State must be at least five percent of the Title I schools in the State." Mississippi served 720 Title I Schools in 2010-11; thus, the number of Priority schools identified will be a minimum of 36, or 5% of the Title I schools in the State.

Criteria for Priority School Status

1. The current year QDI-Overall is in the lowest 5% of QDI-Overall for all schools in the State, **AND**
The difference between the QDI-Overall for the current year and the QDI-Overall for the previous two years is in the lowest 27% of the differences for all schools in the State,

OR

2. The school's 4 year cohort graduation rate is less than 60% for each of three years,

OR

3. The school is a current SIG School.

Category of Priority Schools	Number of Schools
Total number of Title I schools	720
Total number of Priority schools required to be identified	36
Total number of schools on list generated based on overall rating that are currently-served Tier I or Tier II SIG schools	17
Total number of schools on list generated based on overall rating that are Title I-eligible or Title I-participating high schools with a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years	6
Total number of schools on list generated based on overall rating that are among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools	13

2.D.ii Provide the SEA's list of Priority schools on page 68.

MDE has provided data to demonstrate that the identified number of schools meet the definition in Attachment 8a.

2.D.iii Describe the meaningful interventions aligned with the turnaround principles that an LEA with Priority schools will implement.

a. SEA Interventions

MDE is committed to providing a coordinated, seamless system of intervention and support to Priority schools. Under the new flexibility, multiple offices will consolidate efforts to support intervention implementation in the Priority schools. Through the identification process for these schools, a minimum of 36 schools (or 5% of the 720 Title I-participating schools) will be identified for Priority status. Of those 36 schools, 17 schools are Tier I or II SIG participants for 2012-13. SIG Priority Schools are bound by the turnaround principles through SIG awards. Each SIG school has an approved plan describing how the school will meet each requirement. Each school has a three-year (annually renewable) grant to support the inventions. All schools have at least \$500,000 a year but no more than \$2,000,000 available through 1003g. SIG schools must use any additional federal funds to support their approved school improvement implementation plan.

The non-SIG Priority schools will also receive technical assistance and continuous monitoring services, based on SIG turnaround principles. Rather than requiring school districts to utilize set-asides for Choice and SES, as required under ESEA, state and local funds, along with up to 20% of the districts' Title I, Part A budget and portions of the 1003a set-aside, will be leveraged to implement the turnaround principles in the non-SIG funded schools.

All Priority Schools will be required to notify the parents of all students enrolled in the school of the Priority designation within 30 days of receiving notification. Each district will establish a community-based prekindergarten through higher education council (MS Code 37-18-5(4)). The community council will be representative of a diverse segment of the school's stakeholders. The council will serve in an advisory capacity in the design, implementation, and monitoring of the school's transformation plan. Council members, parents, and community members will have access to *Mississippi Star* (a web-based school improvement resource) and the Children's First annual report of academic progress, school demographics, and other key information.

Priority Schools: Requirements, Supports, and Interventions

Requirements

LEA and School:

- Parent notification explaining designation as priority school
- Set aside of up to 20 percent of District's Title I basic funds which must be used to implement intensive interventions at the identified priority school(s) that address all turnaround principles and are aligned with the comprehensive needs assessment (Transformation Plan)
- Conduct comprehensive needs assessment
- Develop and implement a Transformation Plan that is aligned with turnaround principles; addresses areas of deficiency; defines continuous improvement objectives and a system for continuous monitoring and evaluation of the school's transformation plan
- Establish annual goals for leading and lagging (achievement) indicators
- Approval of the Transformation Plan by the local school board
- Establish a Community Council that meets consistently and actively participates in the school transformation process
- Develop a teacher and principal evaluation system that includes student achievement as a significant component
- Implement Mississippi Star/Indistar online system for planning, monitoring, and reporting progress
- Establish a office/staff within the LEA to provide oversight for the implementation and ongoing monitoring of the school's transformation plan

Supports and Interventions

SEA:

- Review of LEA submitted Transformation Plan for each Priority School to ensure that all turnaround principles have been adequately addressed and in some cases, the SEA may require districts to implement specific interventions based on the needs assessment, student performance data, or other pertinent information
- Approval of each Priority School's Transformation Plan
- Training to support the effective implementation of Transformation Plans that are aligned with turnaround principles in Priority Schools. Training will include, but not be limited to: leadership; instructional quality; increased learning time; data collection, analysis, and decision making; community and family engagement; principal and teacher evaluation systems; college and career readiness; professional learning communities; diverse learners (students with disabilities, ELs, struggling students)
- Monthly support and monitoring of implementation provided by MDE staff and assigned Implementation Specialists
- Technical support includes, but is not limited to: Mississippi Star/Indistar reporting and coaching; monthly on-site visits; email and/or conference call support; webinars; newsletters; training, technical assistance briefs
- Provide mechanisms for networking/mentoring/collaborating between Priority Schools and schools that have been identified as successful, high progress, or reward schools

b. Practices to be implemented

MDE will incorporate an integrated approach for monitoring, technical assistance, and accountability for Priority Schools. The approach assesses the district/school's implementation of turnaround principles and determines the types of support needed in order to meet the goals identified in their Transformation Plan. Evidence is gathered through site visits; the collection of progress data; the completion of on-line implementation progress reports; and an annual site visit by staff from MDE that includes gathering and reviewing documentation, conducting interviews, and visiting classrooms.

Transformation Plan

All Priority schools will design a three-year comprehensive transformation plan that explicitly addresses each of the turnaround principles. Plan components will include narratives, implementation milestones/timelines, action plans, measures of progress, and responsible parties. Continuous assessments of implementation actions by the school will be monitored through on-line reports submitted in *Mississippi Star*, on-site technical assistance visits by MDE implementation specialists, and annual monitoring visits.

MDE, Office of School Recovery, currently contracts with eight specialists who are serving the 1003g SIG sites; MDE anticipates retaining approximately two to four additional staff, for a total of ten to twelve specialists available to support the thirty-six sites for next school year, depending upon needs and geographic location. Support will be differentiated based upon factors such as the school's capacity for implementation of the improvement model and the turnaround indicators.

Mississippi's Indicators of Implementation/Turnaround Principles

MDE developed a comprehensive set of *Indicators of Implementation* that provide a framework for monitoring implementation progress in Priority Schools and ensure that districts and schools are embracing research-based practices that address turnaround principles.

The **bold** font text below indicates a federal turnaround principle. Under each federal principle, the Mississippi Essential Implementation indicators used to measure each school's progress toward meeting the turnaround principle are listed. Each indicator is reviewed and monitored electronically using CII's Indistar platform (aka Mississippi Star) for regular implementation oversight.

Turnaround Principle 1: Providing strong leadership by: (1) reviewing the performance of the current principal; (2) either replacing the principal if such a change is necessary to ensure strong and effective leadership, or demonstrating to the SEA that the current principal has a track record in improving achievement and has the ability to lead the turnaround effort; and (3) providing the principal with operational flexibility in the areas of scheduling, staff, curriculum, and budget:

- Principal promotes a culture of shared accountability for meeting school improvement performance objectives.
- Principal communicates a compelling vision for school improvement to all stakeholders.
- Principal possesses the competencies of a transformation leader.
- LEA/school has developed a plan/process to establish a pipeline of potential turnaround leaders.
- LEA/school conducted a needs assessment to inform the SIG implementation plan.
- LEA personnel are organized and assigned to support schools in their SIG implementation.
- LEA modified policies and practices to support full and effective implementation.
- LEA provides sufficient operational flexibility to the principal to lead transformation or turnaround.
- LEA has established a district turnaround office to support SIG implementation.

Turnaround Principle 2: Ensuring that teachers are effective and able to improve instruction by: (1) reviewing the quality of all staff and retaining only those who are determined to be effective and have the ability to be successful in the turnaround effort; (2) preventing ineffective teachers from transferring to these schools; and (3) providing job-embedded, ongoing professional development informed by the teacher evaluation and support systems and tied to teacher and student needs:

- LEA/school has a process in place for recruiting, placing, and retaining school teachers and principals with skills needed for school transformation.
- LEA/school has a rigorous and transparent evaluation system with input from teachers and principals that includes evidence of student achievement/growth.
- LEA/school implemented the new evaluation system for principals and teachers.
- LEA/school has a system of rewards for school staff who positively impact student achievement and graduation rates.
- LEA/school identifies and supports school staff struggling or removes staff who fail to improve their professional practice.
- All teachers meet in teams with clear expectations and time for planning.

- LEA/school aligns professional development programs with teacher evaluation results.
- LEA/school provides induction programs for new teachers and administrators.
- LEA/school provides all staff with high-quality, job-embedded, differentiated professional development to support school improvement.
- LEA/school monitors extent that professional development changes teacher practice.

Turnaround Principle 3: Redesigning the school day, week, or year to include additional time for student learning and teacher collaboration:

- LEA/school has increased learning time for all students.
- School continuously evaluates the effectiveness of increased learning time.
- All teachers maximize time available for instruction.
- All teachers establish and maintain a culture of learning to high expectations.
- School accesses innovative partnerships to support extended learning time.

Turnaround Principle 4: Strengthening the school's instructional program based on student needs and ensuring that the instructional program is research-based, rigorous, and aligned with State academic content standards:

- School leadership continuously uses data to drive school improvement.
- Principal continuously monitors the delivery of instruction in all classrooms.
- All teachers routinely assess students' mastery of instructional objectives.
- All teachers adjust instruction based on students' mastery of objectives.
- All teachers integrate technology-based interventions and supports into instructional practice.
- All teachers provide all students with opportunities to enroll in and master rigorous coursework for college and career readiness.
- All teachers incorporate instructional strategies that promote higher-level learning for all students.
- All teachers actively engage students in the learning process.
- All teachers communicate clearly and effectively.

Turnaround Principle 5: Using data to inform instruction and for continuous improvement, including by providing time for collaboration on the use of data:

- LEA/school leadership teams collect and monitor benchmark/interim data on all SIG leading and lagging indicators.

- LEA/school established annual goals for student achievement in all core areas.
- LEA/school has a process for the selection of research-based instructional programs/strategies.
- LEA/school aligns curriculum, instruction, and assessment with state standards.

Turnaround Principle 6: Establishing a school environment that improves school safety and discipline and addressing other non-academic factors that impact student achievement, such as students' social, emotional, and health needs:

- School implements approaches to improve school climate and discipline.
- School partners with community groups to provide social-emotional supports for students.

Turnaround Principle 7: Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement:

- School and teachers provide parents with regular communication about learning standards, the progress of their children, and the parents' roles in supporting their children's success in school.
- School includes parents in decision-making roles for school improvement.
- School engages community members in partnerships that benefit students.

In addition to the seven turnaround principles identified through the ED documents related to the ESEA Flexibility Request, MDE will implement one other principle that finds its foundation in the 1003g SIG program:

Turnaround Principle 8: Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or EMO):

- LEA/school recruits, screens, and selects external partners.
- LEA/school clearly specifies expectations of external partners in contracts and continuously evaluates their performance.
- School leadership team meets regularly to manage SIG implementation.
- LEA and district transformation specialists provide intensive, ongoing assistance to support school improvement.
- LEA/school ensures that external service providers deliver intensive, ongoing assistance to support school reform strategies.
- LEA/school aligns allocation of resources (money, time, personnel) to school improvement goals.

Monitoring, Reporting, Technical Support, Evaluation

In November 2011, the Mississippi SIG program began implementation of the Center on Innovation and Improvement (CII) web-based resource called Indistar®, a nationally recognized school improvement system for reporting, monitoring, and ultimately driving comprehensive school improvement efforts. CII worked with Mississippi to design a state-specific Indistar®-based system named *Mississippi Star*. The system has the potential to be the vehicle for developing, implementing, and evaluating a singular, comprehensive school improvement process within Mississippi.

The use of the online resource for differentiating intervention support efforts and focusing on the critical elements of school reform in all Priority schools will provide streamlined planning and reduce duplicity as well as the paperwork burden currently felt by school districts with schools served by the varying offices across MDE. Further, the system guides district and school leadership teams in charting their improvement, managing the continuous improvement process, and maintaining a focus on strengthening the capacity of stakeholders to sustain school improvement efforts. The federal turnaround principles and corresponding Mississippi indicators for implementation are pre-loaded into the *Mississippi Star* platform. In addition, the implementation indicators are aligned with research-based strategies from resources such as *Wise Ways*, *Handbook on Effective Implementation of School Improvement Grants*, *Turnaround Competencies*, and *What Works Clearinghouse* (<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>).

Through the online system, schools will build a comprehensive database of information designed to direct their school improvement actions. Specifically, school leadership teams will establish three-year performance goals with interim annual benchmarks for the leading/lagging indicators identified for Priority Schools. At the conclusion of each year, actual progress toward meeting the yearly benchmark is reported, showing the extent that the school met its annual benchmark and providing information to guide the school's progress toward meeting the three-year goal. The extensive analysis of data elements serves as the core of the school's comprehensive needs assessment.

Leadership teams within each Priority school will assess their progress relative to the implementation of indicators/turnaround principles. Indicators that are rated as "fully implemented" must be supported with extensive evidence, whereas detailed action plans will be developed for indicators rated as "limited implementation." Action plans will indicate the research-based best practices being implemented to guide reform efforts for rapid school improvement.

Consistent support for each Priority school/district will come primarily through an MDE-placed implementation specialist. Implementation specialists (contractual support personnel with experience in school turnaround work) will conduct monthly site visits to Priority Schools. The purpose of the site visits is to provide differentiated support to districts and schools as they implement their transformation plans and to gather information on implementation progress to determine further support to be extended. Implementation specialists use the *Indicators of Implementation* as the basis for determining progress.

After conducting each district and school site visit, implementation specialists complete and submit a site visit report to MDE staff, school administrators, and the district superintendent. Site visit reports are intended to provide continuous feedback to schools and to identify targeted technical assistance services that are necessary to support schools as they move forward with implementation of their school's transformation plan. Further, the reports identify areas where implementation is successful, where implementation challenges exist, how challenges may be addressed, and how plans for subsequent years may be improved.

MDE expects each Priority school to implement the Indicators of Implementation/turnaround principles as outlined in their approved Transformation Plan within the first two years, and continue that implementation for a minimum of three years.

The Transformation Plan will include strategies to meet the school's annual goals toward the following performance metrics:

Leading Indicators:

- Number of minutes within the school year and school day;
- Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup;
- Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes;
- Dropout rate;
- Student attendance rate;
- Discipline incidents;
- Truants;
- Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system; and
- Teacher attendance rate.

Lagging/Achievement Indicators:

- Percentage of students at or above each proficiency level on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics, by grade and by

student subgroup;

- Average scale scores on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics, by grade, for the “all students” group, for each achievement quartile, and for each subgroup;
- Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency;
- School improvement status and AMOs met and missed;
- College enrollment rates; and
- Graduation rate.

MDE will review each school based on whether the school has satisfied the requirements in regards to its annual performance targets or on a trajectory to do so.

- *Leading Indicators*—A school must meet 6 of 9 leading indicator goals.
- *Lagging/Achievement Indicators*—A school must also meet a minimum of 50% of applicable achievement indicators.

Each LEA will work with Priority Schools to set annual goals, and the SEA approves the annual goals with consultation with the LEA. MDE has partnered with the Academic Development Institute’s Center for Innovation and Improvement (ADI/CII) to provide schools and districts with training and supports needed to develop SMART goals and implement plans with fidelity, and through this partnership MDE is poised to continue quality support for other targeted schools.

If a school does not improve after three years in the process, state conservatorship is a possibility. The process for entering conservatorship is structured through state law and board policy and can include fiscal and leadership deficiencies. More information is provided on page 103 in Section 2G. Intermediate procedures include a loss of autonomy and MDE becoming more directive with federal grant awards, in an effort to ensure effective selection and implementation of curriculum supports necessary to improve schools.

2.D.iv Provide the timeline the SEA will use to ensure that its LEAs that have one or more Priority schools implement meaningful interventions aligned with the turnaround principles in each Priority school no later than the 2014–2015 school year and provide a justification for the SEA’s choice of timeline.

As noted earlier, the use of the online resource for differentiating intervention support efforts and focusing on the critical elements of school reform in all Priority and Focus schools will provide streamlined planning and reduce duplicity as well as the paperwork burden currently felt by school districts with schools served by the varying offices across MDE. The indicators for implementation from 2.D.iii.a are pre-loaded into *Mississippi Star* platform and include all of the turnaround principles. In addition, the

implementation indicators are aligned with research-based strategies from resources such as *Wise Ways, Handbook on Effective Implementation of School Improvement Grants, Turnaround Competencies*, and *What Works Clearinghouse* (<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>).

	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
SIG Schools	Year 1 implementation 8 schools	Year 1 implementation 10 schools Year 2 implementation 8 schools	Year 2 implementation 10 schools Year 3 implementation 7 schools	Year 3 implementation 10 schools Transition Year 7 schools exiting SIG	17 total SIG sites
Priority Schools			Fall 2012 -notification of priority status -training for priority schools -develop and approval of transformation plans Spring 2013 -begin implementation of Transformation Plan Minimum Implementation Criteria of no more than 25% of indicators of implementation rated as Not Addressed or No Evidence	Implementation of Transformation Plan Minimum Implementation Criteria of no more than 10% of indicators of implementation rated as Not Addressed or No	Implementation of Transformation Plan Minimum Implementation Criteria of no indicators of implementation rated as Not Addressed or No

2.D.v Provide the criteria the SEA will use to determine when a school that is making significant progress in improving student achievement exits Priority status and a justification for the criteria selected.

Given that a school enters Priority status and is expected to implement the turnaround strategies for three years, schools identified as Priority for the 2012-2013 School Year will remain Priority through the 2014-2015 School

Year, even if all the Exit Criteria are met during the first three years of implementation.

Criteria for Exiting Priority Status

- No longer in the bottom 5% of schools based on performance (**QDIO**);
 - Two consecutive years of academic improvement as measured by meeting goals established for Leading and Lagging/Achievement Indicators**;
- AND**
- Community-based council in place and functioning.

** As noted in section 2Diii:

- *Leading Indicators*—A school must meet 6 of 9 leading indicator goals.
- *Lagging/Achievement Indicators*—A school must also meet a minimum of 50% of applicable achievement indicators. One of the three lagging/achievement indicators met must be the AMOs (reading/language arts, math, and other academic indicators) for the All Students Subgroup, and the school must meet this indicator for two consecutive years to exit Priority status.

Once a school exits Priority Status, the school will continue to receive technical assistance from the SSOS for an additional three years for sustainability. During the three-year sustainability period, the school will continue to measure success in the implementation of the turnaround strategies, using the Mississippi Star on-line planning tool for measuring and tracking progress.

2.E FOCUS SCHOOLS

2.E.i Describe the SEA's methodology for identifying a number of low-performing schools equal to at least 10 percent of the State's Title I schools as "Focus schools." If the SEA's methodology is not based on the definition of priority schools in ESEA Flexibility (but instead, e.g. based on school grades or ratings that take into account a number of factors), the SEA should also demonstrate that the list provided is consistent with the definition, per the Department's "Demonstrating that an SEA's Lists of Schools meet ESEA Flexibility Definitions" guidance.

MDE will use the following methodology for identifying at least ten percent of the State's Title I schools as Focus schools:

Per the ESEA Flexibility definition, MDE will identify a Focus School based on the following criteria:

1. The QDI-Gap for each of three years is in the highest 20% of the QDI-Gaps for all the schools in the State.

OR

2. The QDI-Low for each of three years is in the lowest 20% of the QDI-Low for all the schools in the State.

Category of Focus Schools	Number of Schools
Total number of Title I schools	720
Total number of schools required to be identified as Focus schools	72 (MDE tentatively has 80.)
Total number of schools on list generated based on overall rating that are Title I-participating high schools that have had a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a three-year period	None, all are identified in Priority
Total number of schools on the list generated based on overall rating that have the greatest within-school gaps over a three-year period	43
Total number of schools on the list generated based on overall rating that have a subgroup or subgroups with low achievement or, at the high school level, low graduation rates over a three-year period	37



2.E.ii Provide the SEA's list of Focus schools on page 68.

MDE has provided data to demonstrate that the identified number of schools meet the definition in Attachment 8a.

2.E.iii Does the SEA's process and timeline ensure that each LEA will identify the needs of its focus schools and their students and implement interventions in focus schools at the start of the 2012–2013 school year? Did the SEA provide examples of and justifications for the interventions the SEA will require its focus schools to implement? Are those interventions based on the needs of students and likely to improve the performance of low-performing students and reduce achievement gaps among subgroups, including English Learners and students with disabilities?

Interventions for Focus Schools

MDE is committed to providing a coordinated, seamless system of intervention and support to Focus schools. Under the new flexibility, multiple offices will consolidate efforts to support interventions in the schools. The coordination will also serve to reduce duplication and paperwork expectations for school districts.

All Focus Schools will be required to notify the parents of all students enrolled in the school of the Focus designation within 30 days of receiving notification. Consistent support for each Focus school/district will come primarily through an MDE-placed support specialist who will visit the school/district on an on-going basis (at least twice monthly), evaluating the fidelity of implementation of the school's action/improvement plan and providing support on needed corrections. The district will establish a community-based prekindergarten through higher education council to influence the action plan. Districts and their councils may utilize *Mississippi Star*, a quality on-line tool for districts/schools to use in developing the action plan and tracking progress toward meeting goals.

Focus Schools: Requirements, Supports, and Interventions

Requirements

LEA and School:

- Parent notification explaining designation as Focus school
- Set aside of up to 10 percent of School's Title I basic funds which must be used to implement intensive interventions at the identified focus school(s) that address all subgroups not meeting AMOs and are aligned with the comprehensive needs assessment (Action Plan)
- Conduct comprehensive needs assessment
- Develop and implement an Action Plan that addresses areas of deficiency; defines continuous improvement objectives and a system for continuous monitoring and evaluation of the school's progress
- Approval of the Action Plan by the local school board
- Establish a Community Council that meets consistently and actively participates in the school's Action Plan implementation process
- Implement the statewide teacher and principal evaluation system that includes student achievement as a significant component
- Implement a system for planning, monitoring, and reporting progress

Supports and Interventions

SEA:

- Training to support the effective implementation of the Action Plan, including but not be limited to leadership; instructional quality; increased learning time; data collection, analysis, and decision making; community and family engagement; principal and teacher evaluation systems; college and career readiness; professional learning communities; diverse learners (students with disabilities, ELs, struggling students)
- Technical assistance and support of action plan development and implementation, including but not limited to coaching; email and/or conference call support; webinars; and training
- Provide mechanisms for networking/mentoring/collaborating between Focus Schools and schools that have been identified as successful, high progress, or reward schools

In-depth Performance Review and Support

The intervention model to be employed with Focus schools includes a comprehensive needs assessment and qualified support specialists to assist schools in the implementation of the school improvement (action) plan. Each school, with the support of its district, will conduct a self-evaluation, through *Mississippi Star*, of the level of need/performance on the research-based key indicators for continuous improvement. Focus school sites will be

trained on strategies as part of their targeted interventions to address student achievement gaps.

Rather than utilizing set-asides for Choice and SES, as required under NCLB, Focus schools will be required to use a minimum of 10% of the school's Title I, Part A allocation for specific interventions related to achievement gaps. To receive Focus status, a school has a low-performing QDI-Low subgroup. However that subgroup is further comprised of traditional ESEA subgroups. In order to exit Focus status, a school must meet AMOs for the subgroup that had the largest impact on school's QDI-Low. Therefore, the interventions identified in each Focus School's Action Plan will address the high-impact subgroup. Job-embedded professional development will play a role in supporting instructional best practice. As funds are available, these schools may also receive 1003a funding to support specific interventions for achievement gaps.

The primary goal of the Focus School Action Plan and the corresponding support from MDE is to establish safeguards to ensure appropriate attention is given and action is taken when one or more subgroups are not meeting goals even if the school is making progress on its index measure or for the consolidated subgroup. MDE plans to utilize CII's Indistar platform for developing the action plan, monitoring interventions, and providing distance-based support through CII's Indicators in Action web-based video series. The indicators that each school will use as the needs assessment/self-evaluation are included in **Attachment 8b1**. Each school will receive training on the use of the platform in early Fall 2012. On-site support specialists will assist schools with development and implementation of the action plan throughout the school year. *AMOs will be used to identify persistently low ESEA subgroups, and those schools with extended low performance will be required to develop and implement action plans for improving student performance for each ESEA subgroup not meeting AMOs for two consecutive years.*

Throughout Focus School implementation, the identified school will receive continuous support both on-site and off-site through a team of state specialists to help with the development of action plans and with the implementation. Support will also help the schools with identifying training needs based upon the problem areas. For example, if a Focus School's low performance includes student with disabilities in the area of Algebra I, the interventions might include but will not be limited to the following:

- Require LEA to send students with disabilities who have not passed the Algebra I end of course test to the MDE remediation sessions designed for students;
- Require the LEA to send administrators to the remediation best practices sessions designed for administrators; and

- Require teachers and administrators to attend the CII Indicator in Action web-based video series on differentiating assignments in response to student performance on pre-tests and other methods of assessment.

Timeline for Focus Schools

Summer-Fall 2012	Spring 2013	School Year 2013-14
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MDE will notify LEAs of Focus status for schools on a preliminary basis in August; time allowed to review data used for identification. MDE will provide initial training for school specialists during this time to ensure teams are supporting schools upon final identification. • Immediately after official notification in September, MDE will provide training for LEAs with Focus schools on the use of Indistar to develop Focus School Action plans and assign school support specialists for on-going training, technical assistance, and support. • LEA will conduct and/or revise comprehensive needs assessment and use the results to develop and approve Focus School Action plans. Self-assessments will be due in October. • School and LEA will begin implementation of Action Plan, focusing on interventions for subgroup performance in October. • If funds are available, MDE will approve 1003a applications for LEAs with Focus Schools in November. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School and LEA will continue implementation of Action Plan, focusing on interventions for subgroup performance. • Action plan must have tasks developed and in the implementation phase for any indicators not already at full implementation level by January 2013. • MDE will provide on-going support, training, and technical assistance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School and LEA will continue implementation of Action Plan, revising comprehensive needs assessment annually. • MDE will provide on-going support, training, and technical assistance.

2.E.iv Provide the criteria the SEA will use to determine when a school that is making significant progress in improving student achievement and narrowing achievement gaps exits Focus status and a justification for the criteria selected.

Per the ESEA Flexibility definition, MDE will identify a Focus School based on the following criteria:

1. The QDI-Gap for each of three years is in the highest 20% of the QDI-Gaps for all the schools in the State.

OR

2. The QDI-Low for each of three years is in the lowest 20% of the QDI-Low for all the schools in the State.

Once a school enters Focus status, the school will not exit Focus status until all the Exit Criteria are met for two consecutive years. The first step of additional oversight for schools not meeting AMOs will come through the annually completed Consolidated Federal Programs Application that includes the school district's expenditures for Title I-A and Title II-A of ESEA. The current application includes assurances and strategies for addressing the five goals of NCLB. Upon approval of the ESEA Request, the application will necessarily be revised to include assurances and strategies for meeting AMOs as outlined in the ESEA Request. Schools that do not meet the criteria within two years may lose autonomy in selecting and implementing interventions to address the needs of the subgroups not meeting AMOs. The final consequence, state conservatorship, is engaged on a case-by-case basis, as described on page 103 (Section 2G).

Criteria for exiting Focus Status

- A school will no longer be identified as a Focus school, based upon the definition above, if the school meets the following criteria for two consecutive years:
 - The QDI-Gap is NOT in the highest 20% of the QDI-Gaps for all the schools in the State (Narrowing the achievement gap);
 - The QDI-Low index is NOT in the lowest 20% of the QDI-Low for all the schools in the State (Academic improvement as measured by QDI);
 - The school meets AMO targets (reading/language arts, math, and other academic indicators) for the group(s) whose performance led to identification (i.e., the largest subgroup comprising the school's QDI-Low);

AND

- Community-based council in place and functioning.

Once a school exits Focus status, the school will continue to receive technical assistance from the SSOS for an additional year for sustainability.

REWARD, PRIORITY, AND FOCUS SCHOOLS TABLE

Provide the SEA's list of Reward, Priority, and focus schools using the template. Use the key to indicate the criteria used to identify a school as a Reward, Priority, or Focus school.

Note: Mississippi's school identification lists are based upon 2010-2011 school year data. Therefore, the completed list below is redacted to conceal school-specific information for three reasons:

1. The final listing of Reward, Priority, and Focus schools will be compiled based upon 2011-12 school year data, and those data are not yet available.
2. The ED has recommended redaction of school names.
3. The proposed accountability process within the Request is not officially approved.

Total # of Title I schools in the State: 720

Total # of Title I-participating high schools in the State with graduation rates less than 60%: 4 based on 2010-2011 data (final number to be determined with 2011-2012 data)

Key

<p><u>Reward School Criteria:</u></p> <p>A. Highest-performing school</p> <p>B. High-progress school</p> <p><u>Priority School Criteria:</u></p> <p>C. Among the lowest five percent of Title I schools in the State based on proficiency and lack of progress of the "all students" group</p> <p>D-1. Title I-participating high school with graduation rate less than 60% over a number of years</p> <p>D-2. Title I-eligible high school with graduation rate less than 60% over a number of years</p> <p>E. Tier I or Tier II SIG school implementing a school intervention model</p>	<p><u>Focus School Criteria:</u></p> <p>F. Has the largest within-school gaps between the highest-achieving subgroup(s) and the lowest-achieving subgroup(s) or, at the high school level, has the largest within-school gaps in the graduation rate</p> <p>G. Has a subgroup or subgroups with low achievement or, at the high school level, a low graduation rate</p> <p>H. A Title I-participating high school with graduation rate less than 60% over a number of years that is not identified as a Priority school</p>
---	--

REWARD, PRIORITY, AND FOCUS SCHOOLS

Sort	District	School	School Code	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY SCHOOL	FOCUS SCHOOL
1	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		C	
2	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		C	
3	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		C	
4	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		C	
5	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		C	
6	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		C	
7	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		C	

Sort	District	School	School Code	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY SCHOOL	FOCUS SCHOOL
8	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		C	
9	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		C	
10	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		C	
11	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		C	
12	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		C	
13	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		D-1	
14	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		D-1	
15	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		D-1	
16	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		D-1	
17	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		D-2	
18	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		D-2	
19	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		E	
20	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		E	
21	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		E	
22	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		E	
23	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		E	
24	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		E	
25	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		E	
26	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		E	
27	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		E	
28	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		E	
29	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		E	
30	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		E	
31	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		E	
32	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		E	
33	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		E	
34	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		E	
35	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		E	
36	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		E	
37	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS			F
38	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS			F
39	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS			F
40	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS			F
41	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS			F
42	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS			F
43	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS			F
44	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS			F
45	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS			F
46	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS			F
47	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS			F
48	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS			F
49	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS			F
50	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS			F
51	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS			F
52	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS			F
53	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS			F

Sort	District	School	School Code	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY SCHOOL	FOCUS SCHOOL
54	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
55	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
56	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
57	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
58	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
59	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
60	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
61	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
62	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
63	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
64	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
65	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
66	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
67	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
68	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
69	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
70	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
71	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
72	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
73	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
74	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
75	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
76	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
77	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
78	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
79	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
80	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
81	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
82	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
83	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
84	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
85	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
86	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
87	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
88	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
89	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
90	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
91	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
92	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
93	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
94	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
95	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
96	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
97	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
98	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
99	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G

Sort	District	School	School Code	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY SCHOOL	FOCUS SCHOOL
100	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
101	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
102	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
103	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
104	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
105	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
106	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
107	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
108	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
109	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
110	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
111	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
112	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
113	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
114	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
115	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
116	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
117	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
118	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
119	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
120	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
121	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
122	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
123	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
124	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
125	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
126	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
127	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
128	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
129	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
130	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
131	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
132	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
133	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
134	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
135	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
136	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
137	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
138	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
139	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
140	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
141	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
142	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
143	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
144	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
145	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		

Sort	District	School	School Code	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY SCHOOL	FOCUS SCHOOL
146	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS	B		
147	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS	B		
148	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS	B		
149	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS	B		
150	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS	B		
151	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS	B		
152	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS	B		
153	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS	B		
154	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS	B		
155	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS	B		
156	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS	B		
157	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS	B		
158	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS	B		
159	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS	B		
160	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS	B		
161	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS	B		
162	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS	B		
163	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS	B		

2.F PROVIDE INCENTIVES AND SUPPORTS FOR OTHER TITLE I SCHOOLS

2.F Describe how the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system will provide incentives and supports to ensure continuous improvement in other Title I schools that, based on the SEA's new AMOs and other measures, are not making progress in improving student achievement and narrowing achievement gaps, and an explanation of how these incentives and supports are likely to improve student achievement and school performance, close achievement gaps, and increase the quality of instruction for students.

2.F.i Does the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system provide incentives and supports for other Title I schools that, based on the SEA's new AMOs and other measures, are not making progress in improving student achievement and narrowing achievement gaps?

MDE's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system provides incentives and supports for other Title I schools that, based on the SEA's new AMOs and other measures, are not making progress in improving student achievement and narrowing achievement gaps.

As noted in response 2.a, MDE, in collaboration with school district practitioners, is refining the recognition and rewards program to incentivize schools to improve student achievement and narrow achievement gaps. While financial incentives are desirable, due to current economic and fiscal restraints, MDE is pursuing other avenues of recognition, including banners, recognition at board meetings, designations noted on the website and/or included in a publication, staff serving on councils of excellence, flexibility on some requirements, and other areas of encouragement, as identified by district personnel, which may include additional funds as available. MDE is actively working with school and district personnel, through focus groups and on-line surveys, to identify additional supports and incentives. Further, information will be gathered through research such as the *Closing the Expectations Gap* annual report from Achieve, Inc.

Timeline for Other Title I Schools Meeting AMOs and not meeting AMOs

Summer-Fall 2012	Spring 2013	School Year 2013-14
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MDE will notify the Other Title I Schools not meeting AMOs and Other Title I Schools meeting AMOs of preliminary status in August; time allowed to review data used for identification. • Immediately after official notification in September, MDE will provide training for Other Title I Schools not meeting AMOs and those meeting AMOs on the use of Indistar to develop Action plans and determine training, technical assistance, and support. • The Other Title I Schools will conduct a comprehensive needs assessment and use the results to develop Action plans. Self-assessments will be due in October. • The Other Title I Schools will begin implementation of Action Plan, focusing on interventions for subgroup performance in October. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Other Title I Schools will continue implementation of Action Plan, focusing on interventions for subgroup performance. • Action plan must have tasks listed in the implementation phase for any indicators not already at full implementation level by January 2013. • MDE will provide support, training, and technical assistance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Other Title I Schools will continue implementation of Action Plan, revising comprehensive needs assessment annually. • MDE will provide support, training, and technical assistance.

MDE's Office of Instructional Enhancement will be responsible for the other Title I schools not meeting AMOs but are not in the Priority category and the other Title I schools meeting AMOs but are not in the Reward category. Each school not meeting AMOs in the same category (ELA, Math, OAI) for two consecutive years will use the Indistar system to complete a self-evaluation based on the indicators provided in **Attachment 8b1**. For the initial year of implementation, if the school missed AYP in a category for 2011 determinations and misses the AMO in the same category for the 2012 determinations, then a school will be required to write an action plan. Each school will develop an action plan based on at least three of the indicators.

The self-evaluation and the action plan for the Other Title I Schools will be monitored by the Office of Instructional Enhancement. The primary goal of the Action Plan for the Other Title I Schools is to establish safeguards to ensure appropriate attention is given and action is taken when one or more subgroups are not meeting goals even if the school is making progress on its index measure or for the consolidated subgroup. MDE plans to utilize CII's Indistar platform for developing the action plan, monitoring interventions,

and providing distance-based support through CII's Indicators in Action video series. The indicators that each school will use as the needs assessment/self-evaluation are included in **Attachment 8b1**. Each school will receive training on the use of the platform in early Fall 2012. MDE's Office of Instructional Enhancement will assist the Other Title I schools with the implementation of the action plan tasks throughout the school year. The Other Title I schools that are meeting AMOs will be required to attend a regional training once each year on analyzing data. The Other Title I schools that are not meeting AMOs will be required to attend a regional training twice each year on analyzing data.

Supports and Interventions include the following for schools that are not Reward, Focus, or Priority:

**Other Title I Schools Meeting AMOs and
Other Title I Schools Not Meeting AMOs**

- LEA must establish a data team with training support from MDE through regional meetings. Other Title I Schools Not Meeting AMOs will attend twice per year. Other Title I Schools Meeting AMOs will attend once per year. Technical assistance will be provided to help the schools determine why they are not making progress.
- LEA is required to attend training that targets the needs of subgroups.
- LEA develops and implements Individual Professional Development Plans (IPDPs) for teachers and school leaders targeting the needs of subgroups.
- LEA ensures that schools implement Mississippi's Response to Intervention model, including each step of the RtI process.
- LEA participates in the CII Indicators in Action Video Series for targeted areas.
- LEA participates in all MDE training opportunities, and disseminates information to school staff, particularly as it relates to state initiatives (Common Core, RtI, PLCs, Pathways to Success, state science framework, MS Comprehensive Literacy Instructional Model, pre-K, Writing Project, assessment).
- LEA ensures that all staff members are trained on the principal and teacher evaluation process. MDE is requiring that all administrations attend training.

**Consequence if Title I
Schools Don't Make
Improvements**

- LEA is required to attend MDE training on Professional Learning Communities (PLCs).
- LEA ensures that students who have failed the state test attend MDE remediation sessions.
- LEA participates in the Office of Student Assessment's remediation best practices for administrators.
- LEA uses Title II funds to pay for additional days of onsite training such as the Writing Project
- LEA uses Title I funds to employ a master teacher to provide support in the targeted area(s).
- LEA ensures that schools demonstrating the greatest need based on data receive the highest percentage of resources.

Every school in the state must meet AMOs or develop an action plan to support instruction to meeting AMOs for all subgroups. The SSOS will provide all MDE Offices and Schools with a catalog of trainings and supports. When working with schools, each respective office will notify the Office of Instructional Enhancement regarding the type of support needed for specific schools in order to coordinate efforts in a structured manner. Schools that do not make progress within two years will move toward a more directive intervention from MDE, as an intermediate step between local control of interventions and state conservatorship. The Office of Instructional Enhancement will facilitate the support that will be provided as well as bring offices together to plan for subsequent school years. For example, an action plan for a high school not meeting graduation rate AMOs might include the following:

- Attend all MDE training on dropout prevention, including the annual conference, Pathways to Success, and iCAP;
- Assess and implement best practices in high school reform, such as providing clear pathways for success, positive behavior interventions and supports, and credit recovery options;
- Through the framework of the CII Indicators, evaluate student data to identify students in need of instructional support and complete all corresponding training activities through Indicators in Action; and
- Leverage available resources to provide supports for students at risk of not completing high school.

2.F.ii Are those incentives and supports likely to improve student achievement, close achievement gaps, and increase the quality of instruction for all students, including English Learners and students with disabilities?

State Superintendent Dr. Tom Burnham has shared the seven successful strategies of the highest performing schools in the world with legislators, school boards, district leaders, and principals throughout the state. Marc Tucker's report *Standing on the Shoulders of Giants*, commissioned by the ED, and the corresponding book *Surpassing Shanghai: An Agenda for American Education Built on the World's Leading Systems*, have served as the basis for Dr. Burnham's presentations. Included in the seven strategies is the finding that schools must operate along professional lines. To that end, MDE is launching an intensive effort to guide training and support for all districts in the state to implement the professional learning communities framework. MDE Office of Associate Superintendent for Instructional Enhancement is a newly created position designed to offer guidance on a statewide level to meet the needs of schools. The office will coordinate efforts to sustain technical assistance for all schools that might not be in the Focus or Priority designation, yet need support in focusing on gaps, instructional interventions, best practice instructional strategies, and other emerging initiatives. The office, working with offices across MDE, will focus

interventions on the subgroups not meeting AMOs, as identified through the required report cards.

For Title I Schools not identified as Focus or Priority, yet not meeting AMOs for any subgroup, including ESEA subgroups, districts will ensure that schools are planning and expending ESEA dollars in ways that will best meet the needs of the lower performing group(s). Plans for funding will make clear links to the supports in place to ensure that all students meet the challenging academic and performance standards of the state's adopted college- and career-ready standards. The Office of the Associate Superintendent for Instructional Enhancement, with the support of other MDE offices such as Federal Programs, will actively support districts in the implementation of practices that will ensure that subgroups are meeting AMOs.

The Flexibility Request will provide MDE with a variety of options in supporting not only Priority, Focus, and Reward schools, but also other schools not making progress. For example, the Flexibility Request includes the *Optional Flexibility* as relates to ESEA sections 4201(b)(1)(A) and 4204(b)(2)(A) that restrict the activities provided by a community learning center under the Twenty-First Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) program to activities provided only during non-school hours or periods when school is not in session (*i.e.*, before and after school or during summer recess). MDE requests that the requirement be waived so that 21st CCLC funds may be used to support expanded learning time during the school day in addition to activities during non-school hours or periods when school is not in session.

As noted in the ED FAQ Addendum 3, “the flexibility allows for an additional use of funds for the 21st CCLC program—to provide activities that support high-quality expanded learning time. Expanded learning time is the time that an LEA or school extends its normal school day, week, or year to provide additional instruction or educational programs for all students beyond the State-mandated requirements for the minimum number of hours in a school day, days in a school week, or days or weeks in a school year.” MDE will work with 21st CCLC grantees to utilize this flexibility in ways to increase enrichment for students while allowing teachers time for engaging professional collaboration.

MDE plans to provide differentiated supports and interventions, especially for schools not meeting the needs of English learners and students with disabilities. MDE will utilize CII's Indistar system to support schools in developing action plans to design appropriate interventions.

Mississippi Law creates an additional level of support for what is currently termed a “Schools At-Risk” and these schools are served through the Office of School Improvement (Schools At-Risk Services).

Program Purpose

The Office of School Improvement is responsible for the implementation of state legislation regarding low performing schools (MS Code § 37-18-1 through 7). Mississippi Code 37-18-1, 3, 5, and 7, originally enacted by Senate Bill 2488 of the 2000 Regular Session, calls for the evaluation of “Schools At-Risk.” “Schools At-Risk” are so determined because they have a QDI for one year of less than 100 **or** they have a QDI for two consecutive years of less than 133 without any improvement **and** the school is not already in one of the other school statuses that would garner support from another office. These schools are evaluated by a team of trained practicing and retired educators tasked with assessing school effectiveness to identify possible areas of weakness within the school and/or system that could be contributing to the low performance of students. Evaluation teams are equipped with instruments designed to evaluate the areas of Leadership, Curriculum and Assessment, Delivery of Instruction, and School Climate. Identified weaknesses and recommendations are then processed in a report that is presented to school/district personnel and the community so that a plan for improvement can be cooperatively designed and implemented.

Implementation Process

MDE personnel will provide assistance to the contracted evaluation teams to conduct the on-site evaluations in identified schools. This includes but is not limited to:

- Assisting with preparation for the Evaluation Team site visit;
- Providing technical assistance to school and district personnel before, during, and after the evaluation team visit;
- Assisting the team members, as well as local school and district personnel, in facilitating the evaluation process;
- Assisting in the development of School Improvement Action Plans and Individual Personnel Improvement Plans;
- Conducting community meetings and assisting with the recruitment and development of the local Community Advisory (P16) Council at each school site; and,
- Providing overall support to schools identified as Schools At-Risk as well as their associated school district.

Specific Technical Assistance to Schools At-Risk

A Technical Assistance Specialist from the Office of School Improvement, as well as a team of at least three (3) members, is assigned to each school to aid the school and district personnel by:

- Assisting in the development and implementation of each Action Plan by focusing on three (3) to five (5) targeted areas identified by the evaluation process;
- Assist principals/leadership teams with monthly status reports on the implementation of the Action Plans to the local school board and community; and,
- Assisting in finding relevant professional development and/or mentors for personnel placed on individual improvement plans.

For the other schools that are not a School At-Risk, Priority, or Focus, but are not meeting AMOs, MDE will provide oversight/support through Title I plans, which must show how federal dollars are aligned to address and improve student performance toward meeting AMOs. For example, schools not meeting AMOs will provide plans of action through the annually completed Consolidated Federal Programs Application that includes the school district's expenditures for Title I-A and Title II-A of ESEA. The current application includes assurances and strategies for addressing the five goals of NCLB. Upon approval of the ESEA Request, the application will necessarily be revised to include assurances and strategies for meeting AMOs as outlined in the ESEA Request.

2.G BUILD SEA, LEA, AND SCHOOL CAPACITY TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING

2.G Describe the SEA's process for building SEA, LEA, and school capacity to improve student learning in all schools and, in particular, in low-performing schools and schools with the largest achievement gaps, including through:

- i. timely and comprehensive monitoring of, and technical assistance for, LEA implementation of interventions in Priority and Focus schools;*
- ii. ensuring sufficient support for implementation of interventions in Priority schools, Focus schools, and other Title I schools identified under the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system (including through leveraging funds the LEA was previously required to reserve under ESEA section 1116(b)(10), SIG funds, and other Federal funds, as permitted, along with State and local resources); and*
- iii. holding LEAs accountable for improving school and student performance, particularly for turning around their Priority schools*

Explain how this process is likely to succeed in improving SEA, LEA, and school capacity.

Monitoring and Technical Assistance for Priority and Focus to Increase Capacity

MDE provides a variety of resources for SIG awardees to use in selecting and evaluating external providers, including MDE-produced webinars and questionnaires as well as materials from the American Institutes for Research (AIR). These materials are available for all schools, and Priority and Focus Schools will use all the resources available to make the soundest educational decisions for their needs.

Priority Schools

MDE is undertaking an integrated approach to SIG monitoring and school accountability, which will be applied to all Priority schools. The approach is intended to assess the district/school's progress in the implementation of the school improvement intervention model and to determine the types of support needed in order for the school to meet the goals identified in its action plan.

The integrated approach to school improvement grant monitoring and school accountability ensures a comprehensive evidence base. MDE will make use of existing data sources where possible. Evidence will be gathered through site visits by Implementation specialists, the collection of progress data, the completion of implementation progress reports, and an annual site visit by staff from MDE that includes gathering and reviewing documentation, conducting interviews, and visiting classrooms.

MDE staff will share findings from the information gathered with the districts and schools to help them understand where implementation is successful, where implementation challenges exist, how challenges may be addressed, and how plans for subsequent years may be improved. The

integrated approach will establish common data collection processes to gather information that will be immediately useful to schools in their work, as well as useful to long-term accountability requirements and grant renewal decisions.

The full description of the process is included in **Attachment 8b**.

Sufficient Support for Interventions

As noted in 2d, MDE is committed to providing a coordinated, seamless system of intervention and support to Priority schools. Under the new flexibility, multiple offices will consolidate efforts for consistent, unduplicated support. The coordination of services will include leveraging Consolidated Federal Cost Pool, 1003a, 1003g, and state funds to ensure capacity for success.


Specific to Priority Schools, implementation specialists will conduct monthly site visits throughout the school year, following the guidelines established in the attached Monitoring Plan (**Attachment 8b**). The purpose of the site visits is to provide support to districts and schools as they implement their improvement plans and to gather information on implementation progress to determine further support to be extended. Implementation specialists will use the *Indicators of Implementation* (**Attachment 8b**) as the basis for determining implementation progress of the districts and schools. The *Indicators of Implementation* are aligned with the U.S. Department of Education's *Student Achievement and School Accountability Programs (SASA) Monitoring Plan for School Improvement Grants* (published on January 12, 2011) that identifies various indicators of progress for school improvement intervention models.

After conducting each district and school site visit, Implementation specialists will complete and submit a site visit report. Following MDE review, site visit reports will be submitted to the superintendent, district school improvement specialists, and principal. Notes recorded on the *Indicators of Implementation* form during each site visit provide the basis for completing the site visit report on district and school implementation status and recommendations.

For all schools in the state, the SSOS will ensure that schools identified through the state's differentiated system receive the technical assistance needed to improve instruction and student achievement. As discussed on pages 59-61, supports, interventions, and incentives will be provided to schools according to the following tiers: Priority schools, Schools at risk of becoming Priority schools, Focus schools, Other schools not meeting the AMOs but are not a Priority school, Other schools that meet the AMOs but

are not a Reward school, and Rewards. School districts that are under conservatorship will also receive support based on the designation of each school as well as additional support from MDE based on the needed areas. The chart below represents the percentage of Title I Schools in Mississippi impacting each area of support.

SSOS, Title I Schools ONLY



Holding LEAs accountable

MDE ensures LEA accountability through the following measures:

- Reporting:
 - Districts must make monthly reports to the local board on the progress of the action plan (and submit evidence to MDE). (Schools At-Risk, per MS Code § 37-18-1 through 7)
 - District and School Report Cards must be posted on-line and in print.
 - Accountability data are required to be posted on-line and in print through multiple dissemination strategies to parents and the community.
- On-site support, technical assistance, and monitoring facilitate intervention implementation, including the use of *Mississippi Star* reports.
- State accountability laws ensure district accountability by requiring more stringent oversight and additional training for superintendent and school board after consecutive years of low performance. **
- All school districts undergo resource allocation reviews, and districts with concerns and findings receive intensive on-site technical assistance.
- Failing to implement interventions appropriately or failing to allocate resources appropriately could result in grant non-renewal.

**** District Accountability: Conservatorship**

By state law, after two consecutive years of poor performance without any improvement, a school is designated as a “School at Risk” and receives intensive support from the Division of School Improvement, Oversight, and Recovery focused on the issues that caused the state designation. After a continued pattern of poor student performance, SBE may request that the Governor declare a state of emergency and assign an interim conservator to the District.

By state law, a detailed corrective action plan should be developed within forty-five days of the conservator being placed in an LEA. MDE has established procedure in order to meet that requirement. The findings from an accreditation audit compiled by the Office of Accreditation will become the conservator’s corrective action plan. This detailed plan outlines findings, corrective actions, and recommendations required to comply with the standards addressed in the *Mississippi Public School Accountability Standards*.

The conservator has the authority to enter into a contract with an outside entity to provide the needed services if additional assistance is needed to comply with requirements outlined in the corrective action plan. Typically, the LEA must demonstrate academic progress and a significant number of the accreditation audit violations must be corrected before an LEA exits conservatorship.

Mississippi Department of Education

Attachment 8a

Mississippi Statewide Accountability System

ESEA Flexibility Request
“Principle 2”

Proposed Amendments to the AYP Model
(Including AMOs)

Proposed Differentiated Rewards,
Accountability, and Support System

Office of Research and Statistics
Revised: July 17, 2012

Contents

	Page
Increasing Overall Achievement and Closing the Achievement Gap between the Highest and Lowest Performing Students: Accountability Models and ESEA Flexibility	1
Proposed New Achievement Measures	1
The new achievement measures and their use within ESEA Flexibility Principle 2 (DA)	2
Characteristics of the Proposed Model	2
Ensuring Improvement for Students in all NCLB Subgroups	3
Pictorial Description of the Logic in the New Model (Step by Step)	
Step 1. Map student performance on a test scale score distribution to an overall student performance distribution	5
Step 2. Calculate an overall QDI value and separate QDI values for the highest and lowest performing subgroups	6
Step 3. Create school level distributions of overall performance over time (QDI _O) and identify <u>Priority Schools</u>	7
Step 4. Create school level distributions of achievement gaps (QDI _Δ) and “lowest” subgroup performance (QDI _L) and identify <u>Focus Schools</u>	8
Step 5. Use the school level distributions of overall performance (QDI _O), new AMO objectives, and achievement gap distributions (QDI _Δ) to identify <u>Reward Schools</u>	9
 APPENDICES	
Appendix 1 Technical Nuances – Ensuring Reliability and Validity in the AYP and DA Models	10
Appendix 2 Development of the New Model – Data Tables	12
Appendix 3 Resetting AMOs	17
Appendix 4 Quantile Calculations and Subgroup Selection Logic for the ESEA Differentiated Rewards, Accountability and Support System	19
Appendix 5 Technical Notes on DA Criteria and Triage Logic	22
Appendix 6 Supporting Data for the Proposed Amended AYP Model and the proposed Differentiated Rewards, Accountability and Support System	24
Appendix 7 Comparison of the QDI to Achievement Index System	25
Appendix 8 Testing Participation (School Year 2010-2011)	30
Appendix 9 Reward, Priority, and Focus Schools List (Redacted per USDE Webinar)	31
Appendix 10 QDI-Low Subgroup: How this subgroup represents ESEA subgroups	35

**Increasing Overall Achievement and Closing the Achievement Gap
Between the Highest and Lowest Performing Students:
Accountability Models and ESEA Flexibility**

This paper presents ideas for a statistical model to be part of a new Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support System (DA) in compliance with Principle 2 as outlined in the following documents issued by the U.S. Department of Education (USED).

- ESEA Flexibility, September 23, 2011 [referenced herein as FLEX]
- ESEA Flexibility Request, September 23, 2011 [RQST]
- ESEA Flexibility Frequently Asked Questions, October 3, 2011 [FAQ]
- ESEA Flexibility Frequently Asked Questions Addendum, November 10, 2011 [FAQ2]

Included is a plan for setting new ambitious but achievable annual measurable objectives (AMOs). The new AMOs will drive an amended AYP model for the state. As required, AYP determinations will be made annually and reported for every public school and every district. The AMOs will also be used as required under the new ESEA flexibility for identifying Reward Schools and Focus Schools (the process is presented later in this document).

The amended AYP model that will be proposed under the ESEA flexibility has many advantages over the original (and subsequently amended) NCLB AYP model and will produce reliable and accurate classifications for schools and districts in the state.

The original AYP model based on NCLB (PL 107-110) §1111(b)(2) (A) through (J), regulations in 34 CFR §200.13 through §200.20, published non-regulatory guidance (2002 through 2008) and less formal “Dear Chief” correspondence from 2002 through 2008 was based on a simplistic paradigm with inherent technical flaws. The problems with the mandated model lay almost exclusively in the technical characteristics of the accountability model itself and not with issues related to the source data used as input for the model (i.e., score data from the statewide assessments, information concerning test participation, graduation rates, or attendance rates).

Proposed New Achievement Measures

The proposed amended AYP model and the proposed DA model use both the scale score distribution for a state assessment and the four defined proficiency levels (Minimal, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced) for the assessment eschewing the reduction of the student achievement information into crude categories that impede the ability of the models to use sensitive measures of student achievement and growth.

Each student’s scale score is used to determine his/her exact position within the score distribution and to classify students into “highest” and “lowest” performing groups for purposes of accurately assessing achievement gaps.

Each student’s assigned proficiency level is incorporated into a formula for calculating the following achievement indexes (each index is based on the full range of proficiency levels and is called a “Quality of Distribution Index” or QDI).

Overall achievement at the school, district, or state (QDI_O)

Achievement of the “Lowest Performing Students” (**QDI_L**)

Achievement of the “Highest Performing Students” (**QDI_H**)

A measure of the achievement gap at the school, district, or state (**QDI_A**) is calculated by subtracting the achievement index for the lowest performing students (**QDI_L**) from the achievement index for the highest performing students (**QDI_H**).

The new achievement measures and their use within ESEA Flexibility Principle 2 (DA)

The four QDI values for each school and district (as well as the state) – along with measures based on the new AMOs -- provide all the student achievement information necessary for implementing an accurate and reliable accountability model reflecting the principles established in FLEX and detailed in FAQ and FAQ2.

QDI_O is necessary for creating the school rankings necessary for identifying Title I schools falling within certain areas of the performance distribution.

Combining additional accurate and reliable information (e.g., graduation rates) with the achievement information (overall achievement improvement and closing achievement gaps) allows the assignment of Title I schools to the categories specified and defined in FLEX.

- Priority School
- Focus School
- Reward School

Characteristics of the Proposed Model

The proposed model complies fully with the following requirements for ESEA flexibility approval.

- (1) The proposed system represents a fair, flexible, and focused accountability and support system with incentives for continuously improving the academic achievement of all students, closing persistent achievement gaps, and improving equity. [FLEX: Principle 2, page 4]
- (2) The proposed system of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support [DA] ... looks at student achievement in ... reading/language arts and mathematics for all students and [for the students in] all subgroups ... identified in ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); graduation rates for all students and [for the students in] all subgroups; and school performance and progress over time, including the performance and progress of [the students in] all subgroups. [FLEX: Principle 2, page 5; Timeline, page 16 / RQST: Principle 2, Section 2A, page 13]
- (3) The proposed amendment to the state’s AYP model sets new ambitious but achievable AMOs in ... reading/language arts and mathematics for the State and all [districts], [all] schools, and [all of the students in all] subgroups, that provide meaningful goals and are used to guide support and improvement efforts. [FLEX: Principle 2, page 5; Timeline, page 15 / RQST: Principle 2, Section 2B, page 14 / FAQ: B-1 through B-7, pages 7-9; C-17, page 23]
- (4) The proposed amendment to the state’s AYP model includes an algorithm (similar to that used in the state’s approved AYP model) that ensures that proficient and advanced scores of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities (SCD) based on alternate academic achievement standards included for AYP proficiency calculations do not exceed 1% of all students in the grades assessed within a district. [FAQ: B-8, pages 9-10]

(5) The proposed system of Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support (DA) includes appropriate and statistically valid measures of student achievement (and cohort graduation rates) that allow for reliable and accurate classifications of Title I schools as:

- Reward Schools [FLEX: Principle 2, page 5; Definition 5, page 10; Timeline, page 16 / RQST: Principle 2, Section 2C, page 15 / FAQ: C-17, page 23 and C-22, page 25]
- Priority Schools [FLEX: Principle 2, page 5; Definition 4, page 10; Timeline, pages 16-17 / RQST: Principle 2, Section 2D, page 15 / FAQ: C-17, page 23 and C-22, page 25 / FAQ2: C-26a, page 6]
- Focus Schools [FLEX: Principle 2, page 5; Definition 2, page 9; Timeline, page 17 / RQST: Principle 2, Section 2E, page 16 / FAQ: C-17, page 24 and C-22, page 25]

(6) While the proposed system of Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support (DA) includes all of the specific [required] components, the system was designed to incorporate innovative characteristics that are tailored to the needs of the state, [districts], schools, and students. The proposed DA system is designed to improve student achievement, close achievement gaps ... and support continuous improvement for all schools. [FAQ: C-17, page 24]

(7) The state's annual [NCLB] report card will be revised to delete information related to "Title I Improvement Status" (based on NCLB §1116) and add the DA School Category (Reward School, Focus School, Priority School, TINMP School). [FAQ: C-20, page 25]

(8) Reward Schools, Focus Schools, and Priority Schools under the proposed DA system will be identified (using achievement and graduation data from SY 2010-2011 and earlier years) and the list of identified schools will be included in the state's waiver request. [RQST: Principle 2, Table 2, page 17 / FAQ: C-25, page 26]

(9) The proposed system of Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support [DA] will take into account student growth once high-quality assessments have been adopted. The student level growth model will be developed and pilot tested using the 2013-2014 pilot and 2014-2015 live administrations of the state's high quality assessments. [FLEX: Principle 2, page 5; Definition 8, page 11 / RQST: Principle 2, Section 2A, page 13 / FAQ: C13, page 21]

Ensuring Improvement for Students in all NCLB Subgroups

One of the main goals of NCLB was ensuring that all students (including those in all NCLB subgroups) made progress – ensuring that no students were “left behind.” However, the design of the AYP model (using a set of conjunctive standards based on separate demographic subgroups) guaranteed, instead, that subgroup differences could not be accurately measured and that significant numbers of schools and districts would be misclassified regarding their need for improvement.

It is possible to ensure that students in each NCLB subgroup make progress and that the achievement gaps among students in those subgroups are closed without actually including all of the separate subgroups within an accountability model. The proposed AYP model amendment and the proposed DA system outlined in this paper use sensitive and reliable measures of student achievement and reliable measures of school and district level achievement within a contrasting achievement group paradigm to meet the NCLB goal of ensuring that students in each subgroup make progress and that the achievement gaps among students in those subgroups are closed.

Under the old AYP model (using an n count of 40), 74% of the schools in Mississippi were not held accountable for the IEP subgroup (that was 49% of the special education students). Under our proposed model only 2% of schools would have fewer than 40 students in the “lowest performing” subgroup (0.4% of the lowest performing students). See **Appendix 6**, Tables 1 and 2.

Under the proposed system, “Quality of Distribution Index” (QDI) values, described earlier under “Proposed New Achievement Measures,” are calculated for the overall achievement at the school, district, or state (**QDI_O**), the achievement of the “Lowest Performing Students” (**QDI_L**), and the achievement of the “Highest Performing Students” (**QDI_H**). A measure of the achievement gap at the school, district, or state (**QDI_A**) is calculated by subtracting the achievement index for the lowest performing students (**QDI_L**) from that for the highest performing students (**QDI_H**).

Note: See **Appendix 2**, Tables 1 through 7 for actual QDI calculations and **Appendix 4** for information on quantile calculations and subgroup assignment logic.

Schools and districts must improve overall student performance and close the achievement gaps between the highest and lowest performing students (including the performance of students in all NCLB subgroups) in order to reach the AMO goal. If students in some of the NCLB subgroups are allowed to perform poorly, the achievement gap will not be closed and the “lowest performing students” subgroup will not reach the AMO goal.

Appendix 6, Table 3 shows the percentages of students from each of the NCLB AYP subgroups represented in the “highest performing”, “middle,” and “lowest performing” areas of the overall distribution (separately for RLA, MTH, and Science). The “lowest performing” area in this table represents the “lowest performing students” subgroup in our proposed AYP and DA models. It is clear that the majority of special education students and a significant percentage of the LEP students are placing within the “lowest performing students” subgroup.


Separate sets of QDI values are calculated for the current school year and for two earlier school years. Once the QDI values have been calculated, used for identifying schools under the Differentiated Accountability system using the steps described on pages 5 through 9 (figures on those pages show how the classification criteria are applied).

Appendix 5 contains technical notes on the Differentiated Accountability system, the variables used for evaluating the eligibility criteria, and the proposed “cut” values. The procedures described in that Appendix were used to identify the Priority, Focus, and Reward schools listed in the state’s flexibility request.

In summary, the proposed amended AYP model and the proposed Differentiated Accountability system are designed to improve student achievement, close achievement gaps and support continuous improvement for all schools.

The following pages outline the steps used to identify schools under the proposed Differentiated Accountability system.

Step 1. Map student performance on a test scale score distribution to an overall student performance distribution.




Note: The distributions above are depicted as symmetrical/mesokurtic for illustration purposes only – the actual distributions will vary.

Note: There is an algorithm for adjusting the contribution of students scoring in the proficient and advanced levels on the MAAECF in districts where the percentage of students scoring in those levels exceeded 1% of all students in the grades assessed.

Step 2. Calculate an overall QDI value and separate QDI values for the highest and lowest performing subgroups.

The overall QDI value reflects the academic achievement of all students in the school. It is used to compare the overall performance and to assess school level improvement in achievement from year to year. The separate QDI values for the highest and lowest performing subgroups are used for measuring the achievement gap each year and for monitoring changes in the gap value to determine whether the school is closing the gap between its highest and lowest performing students.



Note: QDI values are calculated using the percentage of students scoring in each proficiency level on the assessment:

A=Advanced, P=Proficient,
B=Basic, and M=Minimal

QDI_O is an overall measure of achievement for all students in the school. It represents the “all students” subgroup.


QDI_H is a measure of achievement for the highest performing students in the school regardless of their demographic classifications.

QDI_L is a measure of achievement for the lowest performing students in the school regardless of their demographic classifications.

QDI_A is a measure of the achievement gap at the school. The larger the difference between **QDI_H** and **QDI_L**, the larger the achievement gap. Initially, students in the “low” subgroup will likely comprise many students with historically low performing demographics (IEP, LEP, economically disadvantaged, minority). To close the achievement gap, the performance of students in all demographic classifications must improve – none can be left behind.

The **QDI_O** and **QDI_A** values are used together to determine whether overall performance at the school is improving (is on target to reaching the achievement goal) and whether the school is closing the achievement gap between the highest and lowest performing students regardless of the demographic subgroups to which they belong. [See figure on the next page]

Step 3. Create school level distributions of overall performance over time (**QDI₀**) and identify **Priority Schools**.



***Priority School:** A “priority school” is a school that, based on the most recent data available, has been identified as among the lowest-performing schools in the State. The total number of priority schools in a State must be at least five percent of the Title I schools in the State. A priority school is—


- a school among the lowest five percent of Title I schools in the State based on the achievement of the “all students” group in terms of proficiency on the statewide assessments that are part of the SEA’s differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system, combined, and has demonstrated a lack of progress on those assessments over a number of years in the “all students” group;
- a Title I-participating or Title I-eligible high school with a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years; or
- a Tier I or Tier II school under the SIG program that is using SIG funds to implement a school intervention model.

SIG Program Information from the Office of Federal Programs

Cohort graduation rates for current and earlier school years from the Office of Research and Statistics.

*Definition of Priority School is from *ESEA Flexibility*, September 23, 2011, U.S. Department of Education, page 10.

Step 4. Create school level distributions of achievement gaps (QDI_A) and “low” subgroup performance (QDI_L) and identify **Focus Schools**.



* **Focus School:** A “focus school” is a Title I school in the State that, based on the most recent data available, is contributing to the achievement gap in the State. The total number of focus schools in a State must equal at least 10 percent of the Title I schools in the State. A focus school is—

- a school that has the largest within-school gaps between the highest-achieving subgroup or subgroups and the lowest-achieving subgroup or subgroups or, at the high school level, has the largest within-school gaps in graduation rates; or
- a school that has a subgroup or subgroups with low achievement or, at the high school level, low graduation rates.

An SEA must also identify as a focus school a Title I high school with a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years that is not identified as a priority school.


These determinations must be based on the achievement and lack of progress over a number of years of one or more subgroups of students identified under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(I) in terms of proficiency on the statewide assessments that are part of the SEA’s differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system, combined, or, at the high school level, graduation rates for one or more subgroups.

Cohort graduation rates for current and earlier school years from the Office of Research and Statistics (discuss “within school gaps”).

“Over a number of years” was embedded in the criteria under “Priority Schools” and “Reward Schools”

*Definition of Focus School is from *ESEA Flexibility*, September 23, 2011, U.S. Department of Education, page 9.

Step 5. Use the school level distributions of overall performance (QDI_O), and use the achievement gap distributions (QDI_A) to identify **Reward Schools**.



APPENDIX 1

Technical Nuances – Ensuring Reliability and Validity in the AYP and DA Models

Applying the “1% Rule” in the Amended AYP Model

The proposed amended AYP model complies with 34 CFR §200.13(c)(4) that requires that the proficient and advanced scores of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities (SCD) based on alternate academic achievement standards included for AYP proficiency calculations do not exceed 1% of all students in the grades assessed within a district.

The procedure developed for implementing the rule (beginning with the AYP model run in 2004) uses a simple computer algorithm that applies an apportioning constant to each proficiency flag from the state’s alternate assessment for SCD students. The apportioning constant is calculated for each district based on the degree to which the district exceeds the 1% cap. For example, if the number of SCD students with alternate assessment scores in the proficient and advanced level is twice that allowed, the calculated apportioning constant is 0.5. The algorithm applies the apportioning constant to the each student’s proficiency flag (1.0 = proficient) causing the student to count as “half of a proficient student” within the AYP proficiency index calculations.

The algorithm worked equally well when “partial credit” was allowed in the NCLB AYP model (in 2005). In the hypothetical case above, a partially proficient alternate assessment score (proficiency flag=0.5) would be adjusted to 0.25. The student would count as “one quarter of a proficient student.”

The computer algorithm used in the proposed amended AYP model accomplishes the same task. Since the student proficiency measures used in the amended AYP model represent full range performance distributions (not crude dichotomous proficiency classifications), the algorithm operates somewhat differently.

For any SCD alternate assessment score in the proficient or advanced levels, the proficiency flag for the assigned proficiency level (1.0) is multiplied by the district apportioning constant. In the hypothetical example above, the flag becomes 0.5 and the student counts as “one half of a proficient student.” A separate value (calculated as 1 minus the district apportioning constant) is then assigned within the “not-proficient” portion of the full range performance distribution. In the case of a district with an apportioning constant of 0.75, the student would count as 75% (1.0×0.75) proficient and 25% ($0.0 + [1.0 - 0.75] = 0.0 + 0.25$) not-proficient. QDI values calculated using the adjusted distribution reflect the appropriate percentages of proficient and non-proficient students in compliance with the 1% rule.

Minimum N and Cut Points for Establishing the Contrasting Achievement Subgroups

The contrasting achievement group design in the amended AYP model will help eliminate a problem in the NCLB AYP model. In compliance with the NCLB requirement that data used for making AYP determinations are valid and reliable [NCLB §1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II)(dd) and 34

CFR §200.20(c)and (d)], all states established a minimum N value. Subgroups containing fewer students are not counted for AYP purposes. That meant that for many schools and small districts, students counted within the “all students” group, but not within certain demographic subgroups.

Contrasting groups analysis has historically been conducted by assigning students to the high and low performance groups using the 75th percentile / P75 (3rd Quartile / Q3) and 25th percentile / P25 (1st Quartile / Q1) points in the overall distribution – the top and bottom quarters. There are two reasons for using groups near the ends of the distribution and ignoring students falling in the middle. First, if the distribution is split in the middle and all students are included in either the high or low group, students with performance very near the cut point might be incorrectly classified based on measurement error. Some students who should be in the high group would be incorrectly assigned to the low group and some students who should be in the low group would be incorrectly assigned to the high group. Thus, the corresponding statistics for the contrasting groups would not be accurate. Secondly, using only students falling at the top and bottom of the distribution (ignoring those in the middle) allows performance differences to be detected more readily.

Using the state’s currently approved minimum N of 40, practically all schools will have enough students to have both subgroups included for making AYP determinations. Under the old AYP model, 74% of the schools in Mississippi were not held accountable for the IEP subgroup (that was 49% of the special education students). Under our proposed model only 2% of schools would have fewer than 40 students in the “lowest performing” subgroup (0.4% of the lowest performing students). See **Appendix 6**, Tables 1 and 2. The new AMO/DA models will use a N of 30.

APPENDIX 2

Development of the New Model – Data Tables

Table 1. 2010-2011 Student Level Proficiency Distributions (FAY Students Only)

Test ¹	N-Count	% Minimal	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	QDI ²
MCT2 Language (All) ³	212,463	12.8	33.8	43.6	9.8	150
MCT2 Language (non SPE)	193,431	10.3	33.3	46.0	10.5	157
MCT2 Language (SPE only)	19,029	39.0	38.8	18.7	3.6	87
MAAECF Language (A&P)	2,670	35.3	40.3	21.9	2.5	92
MAAECF LA (Attainment)	2,330	31.0	41.9	24.3	2.9	99
MAAECF LA (Progress)	340	64.4	30.0	5.6	0.0	41
MCT2 Math (All)	212,341	14.4	24.3	47.0	14.3	161
MCT2 Math (non SPE)	193,322	11.7	24.0	49.1	15.2	168
MCT2 Math (SPE only)	19,016	41.7	27.4	25.9	5.0	94
MAAECF Math (A&P)	2,670	36.0	39.8	20.3	3.9	92
MAAECF MA (Attainment)	2,330	31.9	40.8	22.9	4.5	100
MAAECF MA (Progress)	340	64.1	32.9	2.7	0.3	39
Science Test 5/8 (All)	68,073	16.8	27.5	38.2	17.4	156
Science Test 5/8 (non SPE)	62,508	14.6	27.3	39.8	18.4	162
Science Test 5/8 (SPE only)	5,563	42.3	30.7	20.8	6.3	91
MAAECF Science (A&P)	938	24.1	44.7	29.9	1.4	109
MAAECF SCI (Attainment)	835	21.6	44.2	32.7	1.6	114
MAAECF SCI (Progress)	103	44.7	48.5	6.8	0.0	62
English II (All)	32,074	21.0	21.7	39.3	18.0	154
English II (non SPE)	29,522	16.7	22.1	41.9	19.4	164
English II (SPE only)	2,552	70.5	17.8	10.1	1.6	43
Algebra I (All)	33,422	6.9	15.5	43.6	34.0	205
Algebra I (non SPE)	30,730	4.3	14.6	44.9	36.2	213
Algebra I (SPE only)	2,692	36.4	26.3	29.4	8.0	109
Biology NEW (All)	32,037	13.6	30.7	45.4	10.3	152
Biology NEW (non SPE)	29,747	10.9	30.7	47.5	11.0	159
Biology NEW (SPE only)	2,289	48.9	31.5	18.0	1.6	72

¹Test results in this table are collapsed across grades. Algebra results differ significantly by grade.

²QDI is a general measure of performance based on the statewide proficiency level distribution.

Table 2. 2010-2011 Student Level Test Statistics for ESEA (FAY Students Only)

Test ¹	N-Count	SS Mean	SD	Low SS	High SS	
MCT2 Language (All)	212,614	149.7	12.1	106	190	
MCT2 Language (non SPE)	193,541	150.7	11.5	106	190	
MCT2 Language (SPE only)	19,070	139.6	13.6	106	187	
MAAECF Language (A&P)	2,670	75.4	27.5	0	132	
MAAECF LA (Attainment)	2,330	78.5	26.2	0	132	
MAAECF LA (Progress)	340	54.6	27.4	0	115	
MCT2 Math (All)	212,614	152.2	11.9	104	190	
MCT2 Math (non SPE)	193,541	153.1	11.3	105	190	
MCT2 Math (SPE only)	19,070	142.8	13.7	104	190	
MAAECF Math (A&P)	2,670	79.0	29.0	0	157	
MAAECF MA (Attainment)	2,330	82.1	27.8	0	157	
MAAECF MA (Progress)	340	57.8	28.5	0	126	
Science Test 5/8 (All)	68,073	150.3	12.0	110	192	
Science Test 5/8 (non SPE)	62,508	151.1	11.5	110	192	
Science Test 5/8 (SPE only)	5,563	141.3	13.6	110	190	
MAAECF Science (A&P)	938	85.6	33.0	0	154	
MAAECF SCI (Attainment)	835	88.3	32.2	0	154	
MAAECF SCI (Progress)	103	63.5	31.0	0	119	
English II (All)	32,074	650.4	12.2	610	691	
English II (non SPE)	29,522	651.7	11.5	610	691	
English II (SPE only)	2,552	636.1	11.5	609	674	
Algebra I (All)	33,422	656.7	12.0	610	691	
Algebra I (non SPE)	30,730	657.7	11.4	610	691	
Algebra I (SPE only)	2,692	645.2	13.1	610	683	
Biology NEW (All)	32,037	650.6	11.4	610	688	
Biology NEW (non SPE)	29,747	651.5	10.8	610	688	
Biology NEW (SPE only)	2,289	638.6	13.1	610	684	

¹Test results in this table are collapsed across grades. Algebra results differ significantly by grade.

Table 2. 2010-2011 Percent Proficient and Above

Subgroup	Reading / Language	Math
ALL	54	63
IEP	21	31
LEP	37	58
Economically Disadvantaged	43	54
Asian	77	88
Black	41	52
Hispanic	52	67
Native American	51	67
White	67	75

Table 3. 2010-2011 Quartile Statistics by Test Based on School Level Distributions

(All statistics represent scale score values from the corresponding test.)

Test ¹	# Schools	Q1 Mean/SD	Q1 L/Mdn/H	Q3 Mean/SD	Q3 L/Mdn/H	Q3 – Q1
MCT2 Language	682	142.6 / 4.9	110/143/161	156.4 / 4.7	110/157/169	13.8
MAAECF LA (Attainment)	609	67.5 / 24.0	0/69/124	85.4 / 24.0	0/89/132	17.9
MAAECF LA (Progress)	191	51.8 / 26.7	0/53/115	59.9 / 26.7	0/62/115	18.1
English II (All)	260	643.1 / 5.3	619/643/659	656.7 / 5.0	629/657/667	13.6
MCT2 Math (All)	682	145.2 / 4.7	116/145/166	158.5 / 4.5	134/159/190	13.3
MAAECF MA (Attainment)	609	71.1 / 25.6	0/72/143	89.1 / 26.0	0/91/146	18.0
MAAECF MA (Progress)	191	54.7 / 28.1	0/59/126	63.7 / 27.9	0/69/126	9.0
Algebra I (All)	389	653.3 / 7.9	620/653/674	663.6 / 7.2	620/664/683	10.3
Science Test 5/8 (All)	594	143.4 / 5.9	112/143/177	155.9 / 5.9	112/156/190	12.5
MAAECF SCI (Attainment)	408	81.2 / 31.0	0/85/154	94.1 / 31.9	0/97/154	12.9
MAAECF SCI (Progress)	81	63.0 / 31.7	0/66/119	67.9 / 30.9	0/76/119	4.9
Biology NEW (All)	257	644.1 / 5.3	621/644/657	656.1 / 5.3	621/656/668	12.0

¹Test results in this table are collapsed across grades. Algebra results differ significantly by grade.

The values in this table are from the initial run using SAS PCTLDEF definition 5 (see Appendix 4 for additional information).

Table 4. 2010-2011 Overall Performance Distributions
(Student Level Distributions – Students Assigned Based on School Distributions)

Test ¹	Bottom N-Count	Middle N-Count	Top N-Count	Bottom %	Middle %	Top %
MCT2 Language	58,016	102,043	58,570	26.5	46.7	26.8
MAAECF LA (Attainment)	615	1,101	621	26.3	47.1	26.6
MAAECF LA (Progress)	0	339	0	0.0	100.0	0.0
English II (All)	8,484	15,030	8,566	26.5	46.9	26.7
RLA – Across Tests	67,115	118,513	67,757	26.5	46.8	26.7
	Used for QDI _L		Used for QDI _H			
	253,374					
	Used for QDI _O					
MCT2 Math (All)	58,109	100,963	54,428	27.2	47.3	25.5
MAAECF MA (Attainment)	620	1,094	623	26.5	46.8	26.7
MAAECF MA (Progress)	0	339	0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Algebra I (All)	9,175	14,990	9,259	27.5	44.9	27.7
MTH – Across Tests	69,904	117,386	64,310	27.2	47.0	25.8
	Used for QDI _L		Used for QDI _H			
	249,593					
	Used for QDI _O					
Science Test 5/8 (All)	18,355	31,524	18,197	27.0	46.3	26.7
MAAECF SCI (Attainment)	236	364	232	28.4	43.8	27.9
MAAECF SCI (Progress)	0	104	0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Biology NEW (All)	8,555	14,938	8,546	26.7	49.6	26.7
SCI – Across Tests	27,146	46,930	26,975	26.9	46.4	26.9
	Used for QDI _L		Used for QDI _H			
	101,045					
	Used for QDI _O					

¹Test results in this table are collapsed across grades. Algebra results differ significantly by grade.

Note: All MAAECF scores based on the Progress Rubric are mapped into the middle of the overall distribution because that assessment produces a truncated scale score distribution and limits students' proficiency levels to Minimal and Basic.

Table 5. State Level QDI Values (QDI Overall, Highest Subgroup, Lowest Subgroup, Gap)

	QDI _O	QDI _H	QDI _L	QDI _Δ
Mississippi Statewide Performance	158	247	58	189

Note: The calculations in this table used the students shown in Table 4 (selected using the school level test scale score distributions).

Table 6. Proficiency Distributions for Calculating State Level QDI Values

QDI Value (Students Used)	N (Scores)	%Minimal	%Basic	%Proficient	% Advanced
QDI _O (Uses all Students)	608,389	14.1	27.9	43.9	14.1
QDI _H (\geq P75 Students)	160,592	0.1	1.0	51.2	47.7
QDI _L ($<$ P25 Students)	163,009	49.4	43.9	6.1	0.6

Note: Includes 3rd grade language and mathematics scores back-mapped to student's actual K-2 school.

Table 7. School Level QDI Statistics
(QDI Overall, Highest Subgroup, Lowest Subgroup, Gap)

QDI Value	# Schools	Mean QDI	SD	Min	Mdn	Max
Test Data for SY 2010/2011						
QDI _O	832	154.5	31.0	65	156	242
QDI _H	832	243.7	27.0	173	242	300
QDI _L	832	54.3	33.6	0	53	171
QDI _Δ	832	189.3	18.3	113	191	264
Test Data for SY 2009/2010						
QDI _O	843	149.9	33.3	61	150	260
QDI _H	843	240.4	30.0	149	237	300
QDI _L	843	49.2	34.3	0	48	204
QDI _Δ	843	191.2	22.4	95	190	271
Test Data for SY 2008/2009						
QDI _O	838	143.1	34.0	64	144	262
QDI _H	838	233.3	29.8	153	230	300
QDI _L	838	44.2	33.5	0	43	209
QDI _Δ	838	189.1	18.9	91	190	250

Note: 2011 Correlation between QDI_O and QDI_Δ = -0.35 (gaps exist at both ends of the QDI_O scale).

APPENDIX 3

Resetting AMOs

Method for Setting AMOs

MDE will set AMOs based on an achievement index. The achievement index is based on statewide assessments in reading/language and math, which yields four achievement levels: Minimal, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. The proficient level is the goal for all students in Mississippi.

The following formula will be used to calculate the Achievement index:

4. Percent of student scoring Basic times 0.5; plus
5. Percent of students scoring Proficient times 1.0; plus
6. Percent of students scoring Advanced times 1.0.

Note: Students scoring Minimal do not contribute to the index.

This total will be rounded to a whole number and be between 0 and 100 for each school, LEA, and the State.

An achievement index will be calculated for all students and each ESEA subgroup for reading/language and math and compared against the annual AMO objective.

Calculation of Annual AMOs

Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) is choosing **Option A** for setting AMOs for the State, LEAs, and schools in the state.

Based on 2010–2011 assessment data, a baseline achievement index will be established for each school, LEA, and State **for all students and each ESEA subgroup, by subject area**. The baseline achievement index will be subtracted from 100. This percentage will be divided in half. This percentage will be divided by 6 to establish annual AMO increase.

This methodology will be used to establish separate AMOs for each school, LEA and the State and also ESEA subgroups within each school, LEA, and State.

Example:

State of Mississippi Reading/Language: All Students 2010-2011 Assessment results

- Minimal = 14.1 percent
- Basic = 32.3 percent
- Proficient = 42.8 percent
- Advanced = 10.8 percent

Achievement index calculation

$$(14.1 \times 0.0) + (32.3 \times 0.5) + (42.8 \times 1.0) + (10.8 \times 1.0) = 70 \text{ (round to whole number)}$$

The baseline is 70.

Subtract from 100 = 30.

Divide by 2 = 15.

Divide by 6 = 2.5

Mississippi's Proposed AMOs for the State

The following table provides the proposed annual AMOs for the state.

Mississippi Department of Education Proposed AMO (Proficiency Index) Objectives by Subgroup for the State (Option A in waiver - Reduce gap by half in 6 years)

Reading/Language(Proficiency Index)

Subgroup	2011 (Baseline)	Annual Increase	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
ALL	70	2.50	73	75	78	80	83	85
IEP	40	5.00	45	50	55	60	65	70
LEP	58	3.50	62	65	69	72	76	79
Economically Disadvantaged	62	3.17	65	68	72	75	78	81
Asian	86	1.17	87	88	90	91	92	93
Black	60	3.33	63	67	70	73	77	80
Hispanic	69	2.58	72	74	77	79	82	85
Native American	69	2.58	72	74	77	79	82	85
White	80	1.67	82	83	85	87	88	90

Math (Proficiency Index)

Subgroup	2011 (Baseline)	Annual Increase	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
ALL	75	2.08	77	79	81	83	85	88
IEP	45	4.58	50	54	59	63	68	73
LEP	72	2.33	74	77	79	81	84	86
Economically Disadvantaged	68	2.67	71	73	76	79	81	84
Asian	93	0.58	94	94	95	95	96	97
Black	66	2.83	69	72	75	77	80	83
Hispanic	78	1.83	80	82	84	85	87	89
Native American	78	1.83	80	82	84	85	87	89
White	83	1.42	84	86	87	89	90	92

APPENDIX 4

Quantile Calculations and Subgroup Selection Logic for the ESEA Differentiated Rewards, Accountability and Support System

January 18, 2012

Steve Hebbler

Office of Research and Statistics
Mississippi Department of Education

The procedures in the state's waiver request under ESEA flexibility include forming contrasting achievement groups for purposes of measuring achievement gaps and tracking the performance of the lowest performing students. In the initial work, computer programs determined two quantile points and used those values for assigning students to "low performing" and "high performing" subgroups. Low performing students were defined as those scoring in the bottom quarter of the scale score distribution and high performing students were defined as those scoring in the top quarter of the distribution. Accordingly, the program calculated the scale score falling at the 25th percentile (P25) / 1st quartile (Q1) and the scale score falling at the 75th percentile (P75) / 3rd quartile (Q3) for each test distribution for every school and every district in the state. Each student's scale score was compared to the Q1 and Q3 values to determine if he/she would be assigned to the low performing subgroup or the high performing subgroup.

The text below is from *SAS User's Guide: Basics, Version 5 Edition*, © 1985, page 737.

Quantiles

Quantiles, including percentiles, quartiles, and the median, are useful for a detailed study of a distribution. For a set of measurements arranged in order of magnitude, the p th percentile is the value that has $p\%$ of the measurements below it and $(100 - p)\%$ above it. The median is the 50th percentile. Since it may not be possible to divide your data so that you get exactly the desired percentile, a more precise definition is used (see the UNIVARIATE procedure).

The upper quartile of a distribution is the value below which 75% of the measurements fall (the 75th percentile). Twenty-five percent of the measurements fall below the lower quartile value. Selected percentiles and quartiles are calculated by the UNIVARIATE procedure. The RANK procedure can be used to calculate any desired quantiles.

Consistent with the definition of percentiles, a certain percentage of student scores fall below the stated percentile value. For example, 25% of the student scores fall below (not at or below) the calculated 25th percentile value. This is true for distributions containing very large numbers of students with at all possible score values represented in the distribution. So, the initial selection logic assigned a student to the low performing subgroup if his/her scale score was below the Q1 value and to the high performing subgroup if his/her scale score was at or above the Q3 value (75% of the scores are below Q3, so 25% of the scores are at or above Q3).

When using distributions containing small numbers of students (the case for many schools and districts) the logic above is unlikely to place exactly 25% of the students in the low and high performing subgroups. However, in the initial analyses, the average percentages of students being

assigned to the low and high performing subgroups were quite different -- 25% and 28%, respectively. Percentages closer to 25%/25% could not be achieved by simply changing the Boolean logic.

Using all possible scale score comparisons to the Q1 and Q3 points still resulted in non equivalent percentages. The solution was to adjust both the comparison logic and the specific quantile calculation equation.

The text below is from SAS User's Guide: Basics, page 1186. It shows different ways of calculating quantile points.

For distributions containing very large numbers of students with all possible score values represented in the distribution, the quantiles produced under the different definitions are nearly identical and the percentages of students identified using those quantiles would be nearly identical. With small distributions containing non consecutive scale scores the quantiles can exhibit greater variability. The task was to select the definition that would work best with the school level distributions comprising small numbers of students.

Computational Methods

The sample mean, the sample standard deviation, the minimum, and the maximum are computed using the original data. All other statistics are computed after the data have been truncated to single precision (approximately seven significant digits).

Standard algorithms (Fisher 1973) are used to compute the moment statistics. Using the PCTLDEF= option, you can specify one of five methods for computing quantile statistics. See "SAS Descriptive Procedures" for computations.

Let n be the number of nonmissing values for a variable and let x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n represent the ordered values of the variable. For the t th percentile, where $p=t/100$, let

$$np = j + g$$

where j is the integer part and g is the fractional part of np .

The t th percentile, y , for example, is defined as:

DEFINITION 1: weighted average at x_{np}

$$y = (1-g)x_j + gx_{j+1}$$

where x_0 is taken to be x_1

DEFINITION 2: observation numbered closest to np

$$y = x_i$$

where i is the integer part of $np + 1/2$

DEFINITION 3: empirical distribution function

$$y = x_j \quad \text{if } g = 0$$

$$y = x_{j+1} \quad \text{if } g > 0$$

Continued on the Next Page

- DEFINITION 4: weighted average aimed at $x_{(n+1)}$

$$y = (1-g)x_j + gx_{j+1}$$
 where $(n+1)p = j + g$
 where x_{j+1} is taken to be x_n
- DEFINITION 5: empirical distribution function with averaging

$$y = (x_j + x_{j+1})/2 \text{ if } g=0$$

$$y = x_{j+1} \text{ if } g>0$$
 where $np = j + g$.

Definition 5 is the SAS default and is the most frequently used method of calculating quantiles. This definition was used in the initial work. In conjunction with the standard Boolean logic for placing students in the low and high performing subgroups, the calculated quantiles produced subgroups containing differing percentages of students.

Analyses using all five definitions above combined with all possible comparisons ("below" and "at or below" for Q1 crossed with "at or above" and "above" for Q3) produced a wide variety of subgroup assignment patterns.

The best combination places 26-27% of the students in each of the subgroups. That combination used quantile calculation Definition 4, an "at or below" comparison for Q1 and an "at or above" comparison for Q3.

APPENDIX 5

Technical Notes on DA Criteria and Triage Logic

Table 1. Characteristics of DA Criterion Flags (Triage Flags)

Ver. 1.6 / February 14, 2012

Binary Variable ¹	Short Description	Timeframe	Title I Status	Criterion Value Determined	Primary Requirement	Secondary Requirement	State Selection ³
Criteria for Identification of Priority Schools (see Page 12) ¹							
PRI_ACH	In lowest 5% on overall achievement	Current year	Participant	Set in Flex	Must meet both (“and”) Single (“or”) Single (“or”) Single (“or”)		In 5%
PRI_LOP	Lack of progress in overall achievement	Over 3 years	Participant	State Call			
PRI_PHS	Participating HS with <60% grad rate	Over 3 years	Participant	Set in Flex			In 5%
PRI_EHS	Eligible HS with <60% grad rate	Over 3 years	Eligible	Set in Flex			In 5%
PRI_SIG	Tier I or Tier II SIG school	Current year	Participant	Set in Flex			In 5%
PRI_MET ²	Met all criteria for selection	Number of schools must be \geq 5% of all Title I schools in the state (schools selected first).					
Criteria for Identification of Focus Schools (see Page 13)							
FOC_WSG	Largest within-school gaps	Over 3 years	Participant	State Call	Single (“or”)		In 10%
FOC_LAS	Low achieving subgroup	Over 3 years	Participant	State Call	Single (“or”)		In 10%
FOC_HSG	Low HS grad rate	Over 3 years	Participant	State Call	Single (“or”)		Mandatory
FOC_MET FOC_MAN	Met all criteria for discretionary and/or mandatory selection	Number of schools must be \geq 10% of all Title I schools (with priority schools not included)					
Criteria for Identification of Reward Schools (see Page 14)							
RSP_ALL	Highest overall achievement	Over 3 years	Participant	State Call	Must meet all 4 (“and”) but no grad for Ele & Mid Schools	Must also meet below	Selection is optional – state decides
RSP_SUB	Highest subgroup achievement	Over 3 years	Participant	State Call			
RSP_HSG	Highest grad rate	Current year	Participant	State Call			
RSP_AYP	Made AYP overall and subgroup	Current year	Participant	Set in Flex			
RSP_WSG	Cannot have a significant gap	Current year	Participant	State Call	Gap must be small or 0.	Must also meet above	
RSI_WSG	Significant gaps must be closing	Over 3 years	Participant	State Call	Note: Small gap is OK.		
RSI_ACH	In top 10% in overall improvement	Over 3 years	Participant	Set in Flex	HS must meet both.		
RSI_HSG	Most progress increasing grad rate	Over 3 years	Participant	State Call			
RSP_MET RSI_MET	Met all criteria for “highest performing” and/or “high progress” classification	No required number of schools (there shouldn't be any schools eligible for Priority, Focus, or Not Making Progress within the schools eligible for this category – will check)					

¹Variables are listed in the order that the corresponding criteria appear on pages 13-15 in the body of the main paper.

²Variables named "_MET" and "_MAN" indicate whether a school met the requirements for selection as a particular category of school under DA.

³The state identifies the actual schools for each Differentiated Accountability category using specified criteria (based on the required number of schools and mandatory assignment) and discretionary selections.

Table 2. Description of the Statistical Measure Used for Setting Each DA Criterion Flag (Triage Flag)

Ver. 1.6 / February 14, 2012

Binary Variable	Short Description (including timeframe)		Data/Variables Used: IF ... THEN <Flag> = 1	Values Used in Run	
				Pre-Set	SSV ¹
PRI_ACH	In lowest 5% on overall achievement	C	QDI_O_3 < P05	P05	
PRI_LOP	Lack of progress in overall achievement	3	QDI_O_13 < SSV ² <i>This is the same variable used to set NMP_LOP</i>		P27
PRI_PHS	Participating HS with <60% grad rate	3	GRAD4_1, GRAD4_2 & GRAD4_3 all <60	60	
PRI_EHS	Eligible HS with <60% grad rate	3	GRAD4_1, GRAD4_2 & GRAD4_3 all <60	60	
PRI_SIG	Tier I or Tier II SIG school	C	SIG = 'Y'	'Y'	
PRI_MET	Met all criteria for selection		(PRI_ACH=1 & PRI_LOP=1) or PRI_PHS=1 or PRI_EHS=1 or PRI_SIG=1		
FOC_WSG	Largest within-school gaps	3	QDI_GAP_1 QDI_GAP_2 & QDI_GAP_3 all >= SSV		P80
FOC_LAS	Low achieving subgroup	3	QDI_L_1, QDI_L_2 & QDI_L_3 all < SSV		P20
FOC_HSG	Low HS grad rate	3	GRAD4_1, GRAD4_2 & GRAD4_3 all <60	60	
FOC_MET	Met all criteria for discretionary selection		FOC_WSG=1 or FOC_LAS=1 or FOC_HSG=1		
FOC_MAN	Met criterion for mandatory selection		FOC_HSG=1		
RSP_ALL	Highest overall achievement	3	QDI_O_1, QDI_O_2 & QDI_O_3 all >= SSV		P80
RSP_SUB	Highest subgroup achievement	3	QDI_L_1, QDI_L_2 & QDI_L_3 all >= SSV		P80
RSP_HSG	Highest grad rate	C	GRAD4_3 >= SSV		P80
RSP_AYP	Made AYP overall and subgroup	C	Met AYP (2011 used for waiver request. Will use "new AYP" later.	Met	
RSP_WSG	Cannot have a significant gap	C	QDI_GAP_3 < SSV		P25
RSI_WSG	Significant gaps must be closing	3	QDI_GAP_3 < SSV (small gap OK) or QDI_GAP_13 < SSV ³		P25 / P25
RSI_ACH	In top 10% in overall improvement	3	QDI_O_13 >= P90	P90	
RSI_HSG	Most progress increasing grad rate	3	GRAD4_13 >= SSV		P75
RSP_MET	Met all "highest performing" criteria		RSP_ALL=1 & RSP_SUB=1 (& RSP_HSG=1 for HS) & RSP_AYP=1 & RSP_WSG=1		
RSI_MET	Met all "high-progress" criteria		RSI_ACH=1 (& RSI_HSG=1 for HS) & RSI_WSG=1		

¹This represents a "State-Set Value" rather than a value specified in the ESEA Flexibility requirements.²QDI_O_13 = QDI_O_3 minus QDI_O_1, so high values represent progress/improvement and low values represent a lack of progress.³QDI_GAP_13 = QDI_GAP_3 minus QDI_GAP_1, so **negative values represent a closing gap** and positive values represent an increasing gap.Note: Percentile values (P05, P25, etc.) are based on the distribution of Title I schools with data on the variable.

APPENDIX 6
Supporting Data for the Proposed Amended AYP and DA Models

Table 1. Schools Not Held Accountable for NCLB Subgroups 2011 AYP

NCLB AYP Subgroup	Schools with N<40 in RLA		Schools with N<40 in MTH	
	# Schools	# Students	# Schools	# Students
All Students	0 (0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0.0%)
IEP (Special Education)	660 (74%)	13,228 (48.7%)	662 (74%)	13,258 (48.9%)
LEP	879 (98%)	3,040 (82.9%)	879 (98%)	3,023 (82.8%)
Economically Disadvantaged	19 (2%)	686 (0.4%)	17 (2%)	615 (0.4%)
Asian	882 (99%)	2,324 (84.6%)	882 (99%)	2,283 (84.3%)
Black	140 (16%)	2,795 (2.0%)	140 (16%)	2,800 (2.1%)
Hispanic	863 (97%)	4,773 (75.2%)	863 (97%)	4,739 (75.0%)
Native American	887 (99%)	385 (73.5%)	887 (99%)	383 (73.4%)
White	323 (36%)	2,594 (2.0%)	321 (36%)	2,515 (1.9%)

Note: Total number of schools = 894.

Table 2. Schools That Would Not Be Held Accountable
for Subgroups in the Amended AYP Model

Schools with N<40

Amended AYP Subgroup	# Schools	# Students
All Students	0 (0%)	0 (0.0%)
Lowest Performing Students	19 (2%)	615 (0.4%)

Table 3. Distribution of NCLB Subgroup Students in the Amended AYP Model

Performance Groupings ¹		Percentage of Students from each NCLB AYP Subgroup							
		IEP	LEP	NAM	ECD	HIS	BLK	WHT	ASI
Highest	RLA	9%	14%	20%	21%	23%	22%	32%	42%
	MTH	11%	20%	23%	21%	26%	21%	31%	50%
	SCI	10%	13%	20%	21%	24%	20%	34%	43%
Middle	RLA	32%	41%	48%	47%	45%	47%	46%	42%
	MTH	33%	46%	50%	47%	47%	47%	47%	37%
	SCI	32%	39%	50%	47%	45%	47%	46%	40%
Lowest ¹	RLA	59%	45%	32%	32%	32%	31%	21%	17%
	MTH	56%	34%	27%	32%	26%	32%	23%	13%
	SCI	58%	48%	30%	33%	31%	34%	20%	17%
N-Count	RLA	24,974	3,128	500	157,965	5,665	125,621	118,231	2,435
	MTH	25,073	3,163	498	157,249	5,694	124,171	115,998	2,319
	SCI	8,788	941	205	61,226	2,061	50,226	47,263	966

¹The performance groupings were formed using students' performance on the school level scale score distribution for each statewide assessment. Highest performing students scored at or above the 75th percentile and Lowest performing students scored at or below the 25th percentile.

²The students in this category comprise the "Lowest Performing" subgroup in the amended AYP model. All but 2% of the schools in the state have at least 40 students in this subgroup and will be held accountable for the subgroup's performance against the reset AMOs.

APPENDIX 7

Comparison of the QDI to Achievement Index System

To determine if the QDI based Differentiated Accountability System provides similar results as a system based on an Achievement Index, the model was modified to use the same Achievement Index being used for the Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). The **Table I** below shows the results of this comparison.

Table 1 – Comparison of QDI versus Achievement Index

QDI versus Achievement Index Number of Schools Identified			
Classification	QDI	Achievement Index	Number Matched
Priority	36	35	35
Focus	80	87	50
Reward-High Performance	21	40	20
Reward-High Improvement	26	43	23

Both models produce almost identical results for the Priority classification. Identification of the reward schools is close, with the Achievement Model identifying more schools. The most difference is in the identification of Focus schools. Each model identifies similar number of schools, but the Achievement Index Model only identifies 50 of the schools identified in the QDI model.

Of the thirty schools that did not match:

- 10 missed being identified by one year (the model requires that a school's gap be large for three consecutive years), but these schools had one year where they were below the required threshold;
- 10 missed being identified by two years;
- 10 did not have a single year above the threshold.

Description of Matching Differences between the QDI model and the Achievement Model

Priority School

- QDI Model (QDI) 36
- Achievement Model (ACH) 35
- Number that Matched 35
- Not Matched 1

The QDI Model and Achievement Model identified the same 35 schools as Priority Schools. The remaining school identified by the QDI model was not identified by the Achievement model because the Lack of Progress criteria was not met. If the difference between the current year and two previous years is less than the 27 (QDI) or 29 (ACH) [closest to 27 in the Achievement Model] percentile, the school is not making progress in improving Achievement. The school that

was not matched equaled the 29th percentile, but was not less. If the difference had been smaller by one, the school would have been identified as priority and the two models would identify exactly the same schools.

Focus Schools

• QDI Model	80
• Achievement Model	87
• Number that Matched	50
• Difference	30

The Mississippi model uses two criteria to identify Focus schools:

- Largest Gaps over three years (Highest – Lowest) or;
- Lowest Achievement (QDI/ACH) over three years

In analyzing the 30 schools that did not match, neither model identified them based on the lowest QDI/ACH over three years. (The QDI model identified them based on the largest gaps over three years.)

In looking at the differences between the two models, there were some minor differences noted in the rankings of the lowest subgroup. A comparison of the percentile of the QDI and ACH models shows an average difference between the two models of approximately 6 points (6.4, 5.6, and 6.4). The maximum difference was 10.2 points. **Table 1 – Comparison of Lowest Subgroup Percentiles** provides details of this analysis.

Additionally, the QDI model tends to be twice the ACH model in the lowest subgroup, which is expected because the QDI model provides twice the weight for Proficient and Basic (2 versus 1 and 1 versus 0.5). The average ratio of QDI/ACH is 2.0. **Table 2 – Comparison of QDI/Ach Ratio** provides details of this analysis.

The difference in the two models was in the identification of those schools with the largest gaps. Since, the models showed no significant differences in the lowest subgroup, the difference is in the highest subgroup. In the ACH model, the highest subgroup is capped at 100 (100% proficient or advanced). In the QDI model, the highest group can exceed 100, since additional weight is given for advanced students (the QDI model is capped at 300). In the achievement model 88% of the indexes were at the maximum (100), while in the QDI model only 3% of the indexes were at the maximum (300). Because of this compression at the top by the achievement model, the gaps in the achievement model are driven by differences in the lowest subgroup. The QDI model allows more variation in the highest subgroup index which allows for the identification of gaps for schools with a high percentage of advanced students. This is the principle reason the two models do not agree completely on the identification of Focus Schools. **Table 3 – QDI and ACH Indexes** provides more detail.

Table 1 – Comparison of Lowest Subgroup Percentiles

School	Year 1					Year 2					Year 3				
	QDI - Lowest		ACH - Lowest		Percentile Difference	QDI - Lowest		ACH - Lowest		Percentile Difference	QDI - Lowest		ACH - Lowest		Percentile Difference
	Index	Percentile	Index	Percentile		Index	Percentile	Index	Percentile		Index	Percentile	Index	Percentile	
1	43	58.4	22	50.7	7.7	18	24.5	9	20.4	4.1	34	37.4	17	31.1	6.3
2	14	27.5	7	23.1	4.4	29	39.3	14	32	7.3	21	22.8	11	19.1	3.7
3	44	59	22	50.7	8.3	56	67	28	58.9	8.1	37	41.7	19	35.4	6.3
4	22	36	11	30.1	5.9	37	46	19	40.5	5.5	57	64.1	28	54	10.1
5	53	69.3	26	60.6	8.7	38	47.1	19	40.5	6.6	57	64.1	29	57	7.1
6	19	33	10	28.3	4.7	40	49.4	20	42.7	6.7	38	43.1	19	35.4	7.7
7	54	70.7	27	62.7	8	66	78.8	33	71.8	7.0	54	61.3	27	52.3	9.0
8	31	44.5	15	36.5	8	71	83.8	36	77.9	5.9	59	67.2	29	57	10.2
9	31	44.5	15	36.5	8	11	17.4	6	15	2.4	28	30.9	14	24.8	6.1
10	38	53.2	19	44.5	8.7	29	39.3	15	33.7	5.6	37	41.7	19	35.4	6.3
11	33	48.2	16	39.5	8.7	48	57	24	49.7	7.3	0	2.3	0	2.1	0.2
12	26	40.2	13	33.5	6.7	9	15	4	11.5	3.5	25	27	13	23	4.0
13	15	28.6	7	23.1	5.5	31	41.6	16	35.3	6.3	26	28.2	13	23	5.2
14	43	58.4	21	49.1	9.3	63	75	31	66.7	8.3	58	65.7	29	57	8.7
15	53	69.3	27	62.7	6.6	20	26.9	10	22.7	4.2	48	55.2	24	46	9.2
16	47	62.5	24	55.2	7.3	70	82.5	35	75.8	6.7	62	71.5	31	62.8	8.7
17	0	9	0	8.2	0.8	36	44.9	18	38.6	6.3	35	38.8	17	31.1	7.7
18	43	58.4	22	50.7	7.7	15	20.7	7	16.6	4.1	21	22.8	10	17.5	5.3
19	0	9	0	8.2	0.8	32	41.9	16	35.3	6.6	44	50.2	22	41.4	8.8
20	36	52.1	18	43.2	8.9	9	15	4	11.5	3.5	10	10.9	5	8.8	2.1
21	43	58.4	21	49.1	9.3	13	19.7	6	15	4.7	41	45.7	20	37.5	8.2
22	20	34.4	9	26.5	7.9	24	33	12	27.6	5.4	46	52.4	23	43.5	8.9
23	30	43.4	15	36.5	6.9	5	10.2	2	7.7	2.5	32	34.5	16	27.7	6.8
24	6	18.8	3	15.2	3.6	27	36.3	13	29.5	6.8	26	28.2	13	23	5.2
25	68	84.4	34	79	5.4	65	77.4	33	71.8	5.6	62	71.5	31	62.8	8.7
26	32	46.9	16	39.5	7.4	13	19.7	7	16.6	3.1	53	59.6	27	52.3	7.3
27	85	93.9	42	88.9	5	78	87.9	39	82.8	5.1	88	91	44	85.4	5.6
28	10	24.4	5	19.7	4.7	31	41.6	16	35.3	6.3	9	9.7	5	8.8	0.9
29	0	9	0	8.2	0.8	23	31.1	11	25.3	5.8	25	27	13	23	4.0
30	45	60	23	52.8	7.2	36	44.9	18	38.6	6.3	20	20.9	10	17.5	3.4
Max	85	93.9	42	88.9	9.3	78	87.9	39	82.8	8.3	88	91	44	85.4	10.2
Min	0	9	0	8.2	0.8	5	10.2	2	7.7	2.4	0	2.3	0	2.1	0.2
Diff	85	84.9	42	80.7	8.5	73	77.7	37	75.1	5.9	88	88.7	44	83.3	10
Avg	32.8	46.8	16.3	40.4	6.4	34.8	43.8	17.4	38.2	5.6	38.4	42.9	19.3	36.5	6.4

Table 2 – Ratio of QDI/ACH

School	Year 1			Year 2			Year 3		
	ACH_L_1	QDI_L_1	QDI/ACH	ACH_L_2	QDI_L_2	QDI/ACH	ACH_L_3	QDI_L_3	QDI/ACH
1	22	43	2.0	9	18	2.0	17	34	2.0
2	7	14	2.0	14	29	2.1	11	21	1.9
3	22	44	2.0	28	56	2.0	19	37	1.9
4	11	22	2.0	19	37	1.9	28	57	2.0
5	26	53	2.0	19	38	2.0	29	57	2.0
6	10	19	1.9	20	40	2.0	19	38	2.0
7	27	54	2.0	33	66	2.0	27	54	2.0
8	15	31	2.1	36	71	2.0	29	59	2.0
9	15	31	2.1	6	11	1.8	14	28	2.0
10	19	38	2.0	15	29	1.9	19	37	1.9
11	16	33	2.1	24	48	2.0	0	0	
12	13	26	2.0	4	9	2.3	13	25	1.9
13	7	15	2.1	16	31	1.9	13	26	2.0
14	21	43	2.0	31	63	2.0	29	58	2.0
15	27	53	2.0	10	20	2.0	24	48	2.0
16	24	47	2.0	35	70	2.0	31	62	2.0
17	0	0		18	36	2.0	17	35	2.1
18	22	43	2.0	7	15	2.1	10	21	2.1
19	0	0		16	32	2.0	22	44	2.0
20	18	36	2.0	4	9	2.3	5	10	2.0
21	21	43	2.0	6	13	2.2	20	41	2.1
22	9	20	2.2	12	24	2.0	23	46	2.0
23	15	30	2.0	2	5	2.5	16	32	2.0
24	3	6	2.0	13	27	2.1	13	26	2.0
25	34	68	2.0	33	65	2.0	31	62	2.0
26	16	32	2.0	7	13	1.9	27	53	2.0
27	42	85	2.0	39	78	2.0	44	88	2.0
28	5	10	2.0	16	31	1.9	5	9	1.8
29	0	0		11	23	2.1	13	25	1.9
30	23	45	2.0	18	36	2.0	10	20	2.0
Max	42	85	2.2	39	78	2.5	44	88	2.1
Min	0	0	1.9	2	5	1.8	0	0	1.8
Diff	42	85	0.3	37	73	0.7	44	88	0.3
Avg	16	33	2.0	17	35	2.0	19	38	2.0

Table 3 – QDI and ACH Indexes

School	Highest Subgroup						Lowest Subgroup						High - Low Gap					
	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3	
	Ach	QDI	Ach	QDI	Ach	QDI	Ach	QDI	Ach	QDI	Ach	QDI	Ach	QDI	Ach	QDI	Ach	QDI
1	100	245	99	243	100	238	22	43	9	18	17	34	78	202	90	225	83	204
2	100	238	100	267	100	250	7	14	14	29	11	21	93	224	86	238	89	229
3	100	251	100	264	100	270	22	44	28	56	19	37	78	207	72	208	81	233
4	100	230	100	245	100	263	11	22	19	37	28	57	89	208	81	208	72	206
5	100	279	100	282	100	273	26	53	19	38	29	57	74	226	81	244	71	216
6	100	233	100	245	100	253	10	19	20	40	19	38	90	214	80	205	81	215
7	99	271	100	286	99	263	27	54	33	66	27	54	72	217	67	220	72	209
8	100	274	100	288	100	265	15	31	36	71	29	59	85	243	64	217	71	206
9	100	238	100	228	100	237	15	31	6	11	14	28	85	207	94	217	86	209
10	100	257	100	260	100	241	19	38	15	29	19	37	81	219	85	231	81	204
11	100	261	100	266	100	226	16	33	24	48	0	0	84	228	76	218	100	226
12	100	229	100	226	100	238	13	26	4	9	13	25	87	203	96	217	87	213
13	100	241	100	275	100	240	7	15	16	31	13	26	93	226	84	244	87	214
14	100	281	100	285	99	292	21	43	31	63	29	58	79	238	69	222	70	234
15	100	269	100	263	100	261	27	53	10	20	24	48	73	216	90	243	76	213
16	100	262	100	300	100	300	24	47	35	70	31	62	76	215	65	230	69	238
17	100	223	100	279	100	240	0	0	18	36	17	35	100	223	82	243	83	205
18	100	256	100	245	100	239	22	43	7	15	10	21	78	213	93	230	90	218
19	98	220	100	264	100	256	0	0	16	32	22	44	98	220	84	232	78	212
20	99	246	100	249	100	253	18	36	4	9	5	10	81	210	96	240	95	243
21	100	271	100	277	100	278	21	43	6	13	20	41	79	228	94	264	80	237
22	100	227	100	235	100	252	9	20	12	24	23	46	91	207	88	211	77	206
23	100	259	100	239	100	260	15	30	2	5	16	32	85	229	98	234	84	228
24	99	222	100	232	100	238	3	6	13	27	13	26	96	216	87	205	87	212
25	99	280	100	272	100	278	34	68	33	65	31	62	65	212	67	207	69	216
26	100	264	100	265	100	261	16	32	7	13	27	53	84	232	93	252	73	208
27	100	300	100	285	100	292	42	85	39	78	44	88	58	215	61	207	56	204
28	100	240	100	245	99	245	5	10	16	31	5	9	95	230	84	214	94	236
29	93	208	100	259	97	289	0	0	11	23	13	25	93	208	89	236	84	264
30	100	254	100	245	100	235	23	45	18	36	10	20	77	209	82	209	90	215
Max	100	300	100	300	100	300	42	85	39	78	44	88	100	243	98	264	100	264
Min	93	208	99	226	97	226	0	0	2	5	0	0	58	202	61	205	56	204
Diff	7	92	1	74	3	74	42	85	37	73	44	88	42	41	37	59	44	60
Avg	100	251	100	260	100	258	16	33	17	35	19	38	83	218	83	226	81	219

APPENDIX 8

Testing Participation (School Year 2010-2011)

Testing Participation (School year 2010-2011)

The table below shows the number of schools with testing participation rates below 95%. It also shows the number of schools with a testing participation rate below 95% where the number of students is 20 or more. If a school has less than 20 students, failing to test one student, puts the school below 95%.

**Number of Schools with Test Participation < 95 %
(Reading/Math/Science Combined)**

Subgroup	Total Schools < 95	Schools with N-Count >19
Special Education	187	73
Limited English Proficiency	7	0
Economically Disadvantaged	43	26
Asian	6	0
Black	40	18
Hispanic	15	0
Native American	2	0
White	41	6

The Table below groups the schools by number of students not tested and shows the number of schools within each grouping.

**Special Education Subgroup
Schools Testing < 95%**

Number not Tested	Number of Schools
10 or More students	11
9	4
8	3
7	3
6	5
5	10
4	18
3	32
2	49
1	52
Total Schools	187

A majority of the schools (86%) did not test 5 or fewer students. The largest number of not tested students within a school was 28. Because of the small number of students not tested, the best way to hold the schools accountable for testing, is in the AMOs. The Mississippi Department of Education will include as part of the requirements for meeting a schools AMO that they test at least 95% of their students in the "All" and each subgroup. To meet the Proficiency AMO, a school must have tested at least 95% of their students. Failure to meet an AMO for consecutive years, the Department will require a school to develop an improvement plan.

APPENDIX 9

Reward, Priority, and Focus Schools List (Redacted per USDE Webinar)

Note: Mississippi's school identification lists are based upon 2010-2011 school year data. Therefore, the completed list below is redacted to conceal school-specific information for three reasons:

4. The final listing of Reward, Priority, and Focus schools will be compiled based upon 2011-12 school year data, and those data are not yet available.
5. The USDE has recommended redaction of school names.
6. The proposed accountability process within the waiver is not officially approved.

Total # of Title I schools in the State: 720

Total # of Title I-participating high schools in the State with graduation rates less than 60%: 4 based on 2010-2011 data (final number to be determined with 2011-2012 data)

Key

Reward School Criteria: D. Highest-performing school E. High-progress school Priority School Criteria: F. Among the lowest five percent of Title I schools in the State based on proficiency and lack of progress of the "all students" group D-1. Title I-participating high school with graduation rate less than 60% over a number of years D-2. Title I-eligible high school with graduation rate less than 60% over a number of years I. Tier I or Tier II SIG school implementing a school intervention model	Focus School Criteria: J. Has the largest within-school gaps between the highest-achieving subgroup(s) and the lowest-achieving subgroup(s) or, at the high school level, has the largest within-school gaps in the graduation rate K. Has a subgroup or subgroups with low achievement or, at the high school level, a low graduation rate L. A Title I-participating high school with graduation rate less than 60% over a number of years that is not identified as a Priority school
--	---

REWARD, PRIORITY, AND FOCUS SCHOOLS

Sort	District	School	School Code	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY SCHOOL	FOCUS SCHOOL
1	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		C	
2	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		C	
3	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		C	
4	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		C	
5	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		C	
6	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		C	
7	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		C	
8	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		C	
9	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		C	
10	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		C	
11	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		C	
12	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		C	
13	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		D-1	
14	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		D-1	
15	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		D-1	
16	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		D-1	
17	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		D-2	
18	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		D-2	
19	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		E	
20	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		E	
21	District X	School Y	DDDDSSS		E	

Sort	District	School	School Code	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY SCHOOL	FOCUS SCHOOL
22	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS		E	
23	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS		E	
24	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS		E	
25	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS		E	
26	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS		E	
27	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS		E	
28	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS		E	
29	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS		E	
30	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS		E	
31	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS		E	
32	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS		E	
33	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS		E	
34	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS		E	
35	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS		E	
36	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS		E	
37	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
38	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
39	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
40	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
41	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
42	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
43	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
44	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
45	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
46	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
47	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
48	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
49	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
50	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
51	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
52	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
53	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
54	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
55	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
56	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
57	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
58	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
59	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
60	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
61	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
62	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
63	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
64	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
65	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
66	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
67	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
68	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
69	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
70	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
71	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F

Sort	District	School	School Code	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY SCHOOL	FOCUS SCHOOL
72	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
73	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
74	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
75	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
76	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
77	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
78	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
79	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			F
80	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
81	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
82	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
83	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
84	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
85	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
86	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
87	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
88	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
89	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
90	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
91	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
92	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
93	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
94	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
95	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
96	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
97	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
98	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
99	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
100	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
101	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
102	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
103	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
104	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
105	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
106	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
107	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
108	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
109	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
110	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
111	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
112	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
113	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
114	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
115	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
116	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS			G
117	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
118	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
119	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
120	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
121	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		

Sort	District	School	School Code	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY SCHOOL	FOCUS SCHOOL
122	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
123	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
124	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
125	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
126	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
127	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
128	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
129	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
130	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
131	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
132	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
133	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
134	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
135	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
136	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
137	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	A		
138	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
139	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
140	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
141	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
142	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
143	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
144	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
145	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
146	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
147	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
148	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
149	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
150	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
151	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
152	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
153	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
154	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
155	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
156	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
157	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
158	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
159	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
160	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
161	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
162	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		
163	District X	School Y	DDDDSSSS	B		

APPENDIX 10

QDI-Low Subgroup: How this subgroup represents ESEA subgroups

The table below shows the makeup of the QDI-Low subgroup in the Mississippi Department of Education proposed Differentiated Accountability System. The numbers used in this table are test scores of students identified in each subgroup. In most cases a single student will have two (Reading / Math) scores with some students also having a score in Science (those grades where science is tested). The total of the percentage exceeds 100%, since students may be included in more than one subgroup.

Make Up of Low Performing QDI Subgroup – Mississippi Department of Education Differentiated Accountability System (Numbers represent Test Scores)

	Total All	IEP	% IEP	LEP	% LEP	ED	% ED	ASI	% ASI	BLK	% BLK	HIS	% HIS	NAM	% NAM	WHT	% WHT
Statewide Data	163,009	33,729	20.7	2,933	1.8	120,057	73.7	896	0.5	95,837	58.8	3,949	2.4	351	0.2	61,441	37.7

Schools in the Accountability System

Max	870	190	69.4	66	39.7	546	100	41	9.6	540	100	74	39.7	45	10.2	566	100
Min	22	0	0	0	0	9	4.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Average	186	39	21	7	3	137	78	2	1	111	64	6	3	2	1	77	37
Median	149	29	20.6	3	1.9	114	80.5	0	0	88	68	2	1.4	0	0	46.5	32.4
Number of Schools	874	872	872	447	447	874	874	454	454	865	865	664	664	202	202	798	798
Percent of Schools	100	99.8	99.8	51.1	51.1	100	100	51.9	51.9	99	99	76	76	23.1	23.1	91.3	91.3

Max = Maximum value for all schools

Min = Minimum value for all schools

Average = Average for all schools with a value in the subgroup


Median = Median for all schools with a value in the subgroup

Number of Schools = Number of schools with students in the subgroup

Percent of Schools = Percent of all schools with students in the subgroup

Attachment 8a1. SRAS Rubric

Available online at <http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/docs/procurement-library/sras-rubric.pdf?sfvrsn=0>



MISSISSIPPI
DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION

Ensuring a bright future for every child

Attachment 8b.

**School Improvement Grant 1003(g)
Monitoring and Accountability Plan**

**Office of School Recovery
P.O. Box 771, Suite 213
Jackson, MS 39205-0771
<http://mde.k12.ms.us>
601-359-1003**

Revised March 2012

Table of Contents

Overview	1
The Monitoring and Accountability Process	1
Site Visits by OSR Implementation Specialists	2
District/School Online Monitoring and Reporting System	2
Annual Monitoring Visit (Fiscal)	4
Annual Monitoring Visit (Programmatic)	4
Steps in Preparation for Annual Site Visits	6
Grant Renewal	7
 Appendix A	
Indicators of Implementation	9
 Appendix B	
District (LEA) Interview Questions	19
School Leadership Team Interview Questions	23
Teacher Interview Questions	26
Parent Interview Questions	28
Student Interview Questions	30
 Appendix C	
Indicators of Fiscal Compliance	31
 Appendix D	
MS SIG Indicators by Federal Requirements	42

Monitoring and Accountability Plan for School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

Overview

The Office of School Recovery (OSR) has an integrated approach to School Improvement Grant 1003g (SIG) monitoring and school accountability. The approach assesses the district/school's progress in the implementation of the school improvement intervention model and determines the types of support needed in order for the schools to meet the goals identified in their SIG plan.

The integrated approach to school improvement grant monitoring and school accountability taken by the OSR ensures a comprehensive evidence base. The OSR makes use of existing data sources where possible. Other information will need to be gathered at the district and/or school level and is described within this document. Evidence is gathered through site visits by Implementation Specialists from the OSR; the collection of progress data; the completion of implementation progress reports; and an annual site visit by staff from the Mississippi Department of Education that includes gathering and reviewing documentation, conducting interviews, and visiting classrooms.

OSR staff members provide continuous feedback from the information gathered with districts and schools to assist them in determining where implementation is successful, where implementation challenges exist, how challenges may be addressed, and how plans for subsequent years may be improved. This approach establishes common data collection processes to gather information that will be immediately useful to schools in their work, as well as useful to long-term accountability requirements and grant renewal decisions.

The Monitoring and Accountability Process

The OSR has developed a comprehensive set of indicators to provide a framework for monitoring SIG implementation progress and ensuring that districts and schools are embracing research-based practices and meeting the federal requirements for SIG programs. The indicators are found in a document called *Indicators of Implementation* (see Appendix A) and represent a comprehensive structure for implementing school improvement grant plans. It is also aligned with the U.S. Department of Education's *Student Achievement and School Accountability Programs (SASA) Monitoring Plan for School Improvement Grants* (published on January 12, 2011).

The indicators are subdivided into five key components: Organizational Structures, Leadership, Personnel and Professional Development, Curriculum and Instruction, and Support System/Strategies. (The SIG indicators are set out in Appendix D by the Federal Requirements set forth by the U.S. Department of Education for schools receiving SIG grants.) The *Indicators of Implementation* document includes examples of evidence that may be used to demonstrate the extent of implementation for each indicator. Districts and schools should refer to the document to direct their data gathering efforts prior to site visits.

Following are details about the site visits, evidence gathering, and reporting processes.

Site Visits by OSR Implementation Specialists

Implementation Specialists from the OSR conduct monthly site visits throughout the school year. The purpose of the site visits is to provide support to districts and schools as they implement their SIG improvement plans and to gather information on implementation progress to determine further support to be extended. Implementation Specialists use the *Indicators of Implementation* as the basis for determining implementation progress of the districts and schools.

Districts and schools are expected to maintain evidence files to support SIG implementation. Evidence files should be maintained and organized around the indicators within the five key components. While each school may have a variety of items to include as documentation of indicator implementation, the emphasis should be on providing quality evidence (as opposed to quantity of evidence). Evidence files are intended to substantiate that a district/school is implementing an indicator. In providing evidence, indicate what that evidence represents, and if needed, where in the document the particular evidence may be found (page number). Within each file a cover sheet should be provided that lists the indicator, the evidence of implementation, and an explanation of how the evidence reflects implementation progress.

After conducting each district and school site visit, implementation specialists complete and submit a site visit report to the OSR. Following OSR review, site visit reports are distributed to the superintendent, district school improvement specialist, and principal. Site visit reports are intended to provide continuous feedback to schools and to identify targeted technical assistance services that are necessary to support schools as they move forward with implementation of their school improvement plans.

Implementation specialists complete a mid-year rating of the status of their districts and schools on SIG implementation progress (scale: 1 = not addressed or no evidence, 2 = emerging/limited evidence, 3 = satisfactory evidence supported from multiple sources, 4 = evidence exceeds standard, 5 = extensive evidence aligned with exemplary implementation). Ratings are given on each indicator within the *Indicators of Implementation* document (Appendix A). In addition to ratings of progress, implementation specialists identify the strengths and areas needing improvement within each of the five key components.

District/School Online Monitoring and Reporting System

Throughout the school year, designated district and school staff assess the progress of SIG schools using the Mississippi Star Online Monitoring and Reporting System. Mississippi Star is a web-based tool that guides district and school leadership teams in charting their improvement and managing the continuous improvement process. Mississippi Star includes *Wise Ways* research briefs that identify research and effective strategies to support full implementation of the indicators, as well as *Indicators in Action* video modules demonstrating the research based practices.

Each school's *leadership team* guides the improvement efforts. The team includes key district and school administrators, teacher leaders, and may include others instrumental to the improvement process (e.g., a school board member, student support personnel, and/or a parent representative). Each team designates a *process manager* who interfaces with the web-based system, distributes documents to team members in advance of meetings, and enters the team's minutes and work products into the system. In collaboration with the principal, the process manager also prepares agendas, documents, and worksheets for use during the team meetings.

Mississippi Star enables district school improvement specialists to assist the teams through coaching comments about the team's ongoing work. Coaching comments may be offered by the director of the OSR, by the assigned implementation specialist, or by the district school improvement specialist. The school improvement team reviews the feedback and responds with comments or questions (which are input into the system by the process manager). This process is intended to facilitate a positive dialogue to maximize improvement efforts.

The primary work of the leadership team is in the section called *Indicator Based Planning Tools* found on the Dashboard of the Mississippi Star Online System (the initial web page after logging into the system). By selecting *Transformation/Turnaround Indicators* in that section, the leadership team assesses and develops plans for continuously monitoring the progress of implementing the improvement indicators. This self-reflective process enables the team to guide the school in meeting their annual benchmarks and goals. While in the main menu page of the Transformation/Turnaround Indicators, the team can access the *Wise Ways* research, *Indicators in Action* videos, and other relevant documents under the *Resources and Reports* link in the upper right-hand corner.

Also available on the Mississippi Star Dashboard are annual forms to complete that factor into the grant renewal process. The *Leading Indicators Annual Form* and the *Lagging Indicators Annual Form* require the team to develop an overall three year goal for each of the leading and lagging indicators, provide data showing where the school began at the initiation of the SIG grant, and develop annual benchmarks for each of the three years. At the conclusion of each year, actual progress toward meeting the yearly benchmark is reported, showing the extent that the school met its annual benchmark and providing information to guide its continued progress toward meeting the three-year goal.

A third form to be completed is the *Interventions Annual Form*. The form is organized by the SIG Federal Requirements and requires the leadership team to describe the specific interventions included in their SIG plan that address each of the requirements and the expected outcomes. For each of the three years, the team reports on their progress toward implementing the indicators for meeting each federal requirement and the specific intervention(s) relative to the requirement. To assist the team in completing this form, there is a document called *Mississippi Indicators by Federal Requirements* on the Dashboard under *Other Documents/Web Pages*. This document shows which of the Mississippi indicators address each of the federal requirements.

Annual Monitoring Visit (Fiscal)

The OSR conducts an annual on-site fiscal monitoring visit. The purpose of this visit is to ensure compliance with School Improvement Grant 1003(g) and American Recovery and Reinvestment Act regulations as well as to provide support to districts and schools as they implement their improvement plans. OSR staff use the *Indicators of Fiscal Compliance* (Appendix C) as the basis for determining fiscal compliance. The document contains examples of supporting evidence and is subdivided into components that align with the 2011 OMB Circular A-133 Compliance Supplement and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act regulations. Districts and schools should refer to the *Indicators of Fiscal Compliance* to direct their data gathering efforts prior to the fiscal monitoring visit.

Annual Monitoring Visit (Programmatic)

SIG districts and schools participate in an annual programmatic monitoring visit conducted by the OSR. The onsite visit consists of three primary components: evidence review, interviews with stakeholder groups, and classroom observations. Site visit activities and interview questions are based on the U.S. Department of Education's *Student Achievement and School Accountability Programs (SASA) Monitoring Plan for School Improvement Grants, October 1, 2010 to September 30, 2011*, with slight adaptations (See Appendix B for interview questions.)

Prior to the school site visit, the monitoring team will have reviewed and met to discuss the following documents: district/school SIG application, district reports on SIG implementation progress, and accompanying documentation showing evidence of implementation.

District (LEA) Interview The monitoring team conducts an interview with the district staff responsible for SIG implementation. The district ensures that individuals who can address the interview questions are present for the interview, including the person responsible for Federal or Title I programs, and may include other individuals responsible for aspects of the SIG program relating to the application, the budget, data collection, and implementation of the school intervention(s).

School Site-Visit The monitoring team interviews the school's SIG leadership team, teachers, parents, and students and visits several classrooms. The school site visit is intended to provide the monitoring team with an accurate picture of a typical day in the school. The site visit begins with an entrance conference with the school administrator(s) to provide context for the interviews and classroom observations, and concludes with a brief exit conference with the school administrator(s).

- **School Leadership Team Interview** The school leadership team should include the principal and any individuals responsible for the decision-making process at the school. Members of the school leadership team should reflect a diverse representation (i.e., gender, ethnicity, tenure at school). For example, it may be composed of department chairs, grade level chairs, instructional coaches, administrators, and paraprofessionals. Although some leadership teams may include parents or students, it is not necessary to

include them in this interview, as a separate interview with parents and students will be conducted.

- **Teacher Group Interview** The school should identify approximately 5 teachers to be interviewed by the SIG monitoring team. Those selected will include a new teacher, a returning or veteran teacher, and at least one teacher from a grade and subject area that is tested through statewide assessments. The group should **not** include any teacher who also serves on the leadership team, nor should members of the school's leadership team or the district be present during this interview.
- **Parent Group Interview** A pre-selected group of 8-10 parents of students currently enrolled in the school will be interviewed. Participants should be parents who are not employees of the school district.
- **Classroom Observations and Student Interviews** The site visit team receives a tour of the school and classrooms to illustrate the implementation of school SIG interventions (e.g., efforts to change school culture, data use, programs/strategies being implemented). A school leadership team member guides the monitoring team into 3-4 classrooms for a period of 5 to 10 minutes each and explains what the monitoring team will observe and how it reflects SIG implementation. While in at least one of the classrooms, the monitoring team also spends approximately 15 minutes interviewing the entire class of students.

Sample School Visit Schedule

DAY 1

10:00 – 12:00	Entrance Meeting with District Leadership Team
12:00 – 12:45	Lunch
1:00 – 2:15	Classroom Observations & Student Interviews
2:15 – 5:00	Monitoring Team Work Session

DAY 2

8:00 – 8:30	Entrance Meeting at School
8:30 – 10:30	School Leadership Team Interview
10:45 – 11:30	Teacher Interviews
11:45 – 1:00	Parent Interviews over Lunch
1:00 – 3:00	Monitoring Team Work Session
3:00 – 3:15	Exit with School Administrator(s)

Monitoring Report Based on a synthesis of information gathered regarding the district and school's implementation of the transformation or turnaround model, as well as compliance with federal requirements for school improvement grants, OSR will provide the district and school a monitoring report within 30-45 days of the site visit. Following is more specific information about the site visits conducted by the OSR monitoring teams.

Steps in Preparation for Annual Site Visits

Prior to the annual site visits, OSR staff members provide initial training and follow-up technical assistance about the monitoring process. Specific roles and responsibilities for the OSR Implementation Specialist, districts, schools, and the monitoring team are set out below:

OSR Implementation Specialist

- Contact the district and its school(s) to ensure that the monitoring schedule developed by the district is made available in a timely manner.
- Ensure that the school has secured adequate meeting space for the site visit team.
- Serve as the contact person to address any questions the district and its school(s) may have about the site visit process.
- Review the evidence of implementation from files compiled throughout the year as well as through Mississippi Star reports.
- Contact monitoring team members and ensure that all requested materials have been provided prior to the site visit.
- Review the monitoring schedule with the visiting team and ensure that all focus groups and classroom visits are handled in a professional manner.
- Facilitate the entrance conference with the school administrator(s) to gain context for the upcoming interviews and observations.
- Conclude the onsite monitoring visit with a brief exit conference with the school administrator(s).

District and its School(s)

- Provide access to their SIG documentation files during the annual site visit.
- Provide Mississippi Star guest login to the site visit team to demonstrate to the visiting team that the system is an integral part of their SIG school improvement process.
- Act as a partner in the site visit process
 - Makes the purpose and process of the monitoring team's visit clear to all faculty and staff.
 - Works with the monitoring team to ensure the visit runs smoothly.
 - District and school leadership works collaboratively with the OSR Implementation Specialist during the visit to provide any additional documents requested.
 - District and school leadership maintains good communication with the OSR implementation specialist throughout the process, honestly expressing concerns and feedback from staff.
 - District and school leadership responds to the monitoring team's feedback by stating their position and making available any additional evidence to support its position.
 - Designate a quiet, private meeting space for the monitoring team. The space should allow for confidential meetings and should be available to monitoring team members for the full visit.
 - To the extent possible, interviews and focus groups should not be scheduled in this space, but planned for elsewhere in the building.

Monitoring Team Members

- Exhibit professionalism and maintain confidentiality at all times.
- Review district and school documents prior to the onsite visit and arrive at the site knowledgeable about the school's SIG plan.
- Maintain notes from interviews and classroom visits that are used in completing their reports.
- Develop a written monitoring report, ensuring that the report reflects the consensus of the team.
- Submit the written monitoring report to the OSR within 20 days of the visit. OSR staff provides written feedback to the district and its school(s) within 30-45 days of the site visit.

Grant Renewal

Evaluating Progress for Renewal

OSR will make grant renewal decisions for each school based on whether the school has satisfied the following requirements in regards to its annual performance targets for leading and achievement indicators:

- Leading Indicators—A school must meet 6 of 9 leading indicator goals.
- Lagging Indicators (achievement indicators)—The school must meet a minimum of 50% of applicable achievement indicators.

Each LEA will be responsible for completing a Leading Indicator Report and a Lagging Indicator Report (Performance Framework) in the Mississippi Star online system.

- Leading Indicators
 - Number of minutes within the school year and school day
 - Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup
 - Dropout rate
 - Student attendance rate
 - Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment courses
 - Discipline incidents
 - Truants
 - Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system
 - Teacher attendance rate
- Lagging Indicators (achievement indicators)
 - School improvement status and AYP targets met and missed
 - Percentage of students at or above each proficiency level on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics, by grade and by student subgroup
 - Average scale score on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics, by grade, for the "all students" group, for each achievement quartile, and for each subgroup

- Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency
- Graduation rate
- College enrollment

OSR may grant exceptions to this rule if highly unusual, extenuating circumstances occur. In making this determination, OSR will consider the district/school's adherence to grant assurances, implementation progress as shown on the annual monitoring report, Mississippi Star online documentation, and interim reports from OSR implementation specialists.

Implementation Expectations

Year 1 Implementation	< 25% of indicators of implementation rated as <i>Not Addressed or No Evidence</i>
Year 2 Implementation	< 10% of indicators of implementation rated as <i>Not Addressed or No Evidence</i>
Year 3 Implementation	No indicators of implementation rated as <i>Not Addressed or No Evidence</i>

In addition to meeting the thresholds for implementation described in the above chart, districts and schools are expected to show a continuum of progress moving from emerging evidence of meeting implementation standards through satisfactory evidence of meeting implementation standards and into exceeding the standards.

Indicators of Implementation School Improvement Grant

The purpose of this document is to provide schools and districts a framework for implementation of their school improvement plan. It serves as a guide to inform the monitoring and support activities conducted by the Implementation Specialists from the Mississippi Department of Education. The key components of the document reflect a comprehensive review and alignment with federal regulations, USDE School Improvement Guidance and school improvement resources. Examples of evidence of implementation are provided to serve as a “guide” and should not be considered a restricted list.

A. Organizational Structures	Examples of Evidence
1. LEA and school conducted needs assessment to inform the SIG implementation plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Copy of comprehensive needs assessment aligned with Title I Schoolwide plan (including surveys, interviews, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Leading and lagging indicator progress reports
2. LEA personnel are organized and assigned to support schools in their SIG implementation	<input type="checkbox"/> Documentation describing how LEA is organized to support/implement SIG, such as organizational charts and job descriptions
3. LEA modified policies and practices to support full and effective implementation	<input type="checkbox"/> Documentation describing modifications to policies/practices (or statement that none were necessary)
4. LEA provides sufficient operational flexibility to the principal to lead transformation or turnaround	<input type="checkbox"/> Specific examples of staffing, resource allocation (e.g., human, fiscal, scheduling, calendar) and statement from the principal to support that he/she encounters no obstacles from LEA that prohibit SIG implementation

A. Organizational Structures	Examples of Evidence
5. LEA has established a district turnaround office to support SIG implementation	<input type="checkbox"/> Composition of district transformation team, schedule of meeting dates, meeting agendas/minutes <input type="checkbox"/> Defined process for LEA monitoring of SIG implementation (MS Star data) <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation of visits and specific technical assistance to schools <input type="checkbox"/> Use of benchmark/interim data on leading and lagging indicators in instructional decisions
6. LEA and school recruit, screen, and select external partners	<input type="checkbox"/> Current documentation describing LEA's competitive process and criteria for recruiting, screening, and approving external providers <input type="checkbox"/> Interventions Annual Report
7. LEA and school clearly specify expectations of external partners in contracts and continuously evaluate their performance	<input type="checkbox"/> Contracts/agreements LEA has entered into with external partners with goals, deliverables, and benchmarks of progress <input type="checkbox"/> Documented process for following up on professional development activities <input type="checkbox"/> Documented process for evaluating services of the external provider <input type="checkbox"/> Interventions Annual Report
8. All teachers meet in teams with clear expectations and time for planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Instructional team planning schedules, agendas, meeting minutes that reflect instructional focus
9. LEA and school have increased learning time for all students	<input type="checkbox"/> Extended school days/school year, before and afterschool programs, summer programs <input type="checkbox"/> Master schedule that reflects increase in core areas <input type="checkbox"/> Leading indicator progress report

A. <i>Organizational Structures</i>	Examples of Evidence
10. School continuously evaluates the effectiveness of increased learning time	<input type="checkbox"/> Student participation, measures of student academic progress and other student outcomes, reports from classroom observations <input type="checkbox"/> Differentiated activities for individual students based on specific needs (individualized academic plans) <input type="checkbox"/> Professional development for teachers targeted specifically at implementing effective extended learning strategies
B. <i>Leadership</i>	Examples of Evidence
1. Principal promotes a culture of shared accountability for meeting school improvement performance objectives	<input type="checkbox"/> Common topic in meetings with various stakeholders <input type="checkbox"/> School culture of high expectations (e.g., student work displayed, minimized student/ classroom disruption, student engagement, changes in student academic performance, student academic supports, family and community engagement in school) <input type="checkbox"/> Teacher collaboration (e.g., professional learning communities), commitment beyond scheduled workday, involvement in leadership teams, volunteer participation on school committees, teacher job-satisfaction on opinion surveys)
2. Principal communicates a compelling vision for school improvement to all stakeholders	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple media formats used to communicate sense of urgency and message of change (e.g., public meetings, forums, newsletters, parent meetings, business/community partnerships) <input type="checkbox"/> Students, school staff, and parents can articulate their role in achieving the school vision
3. School leadership team meets regularly to manage SIG implementation	<input type="checkbox"/> Composition of school leadership team, schedule of meeting dates, meeting agendas/minutes <input type="checkbox"/> Defined process for school monitoring of SIG implementation (MS Star data)
4. School leadership team continuously uses data to drive school improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Use of benchmark/interim data on all leading and lagging indicators in instructional decisions <input type="checkbox"/> Resource allocations as determined by data <input type="checkbox"/> Examples of changes that have occurred as a result of data analysis

B. Leadership	Examples of Evidence
5. Principal continuously monitors the delivery of instruction in all classrooms	<input type="checkbox"/> Classroom observation reports evidencing principal's presence in classrooms to monitor instructional delivery and effectiveness
6. LEA and school leadership teams collect and monitor benchmark/ interim data on all SIG leading and lagging indicators	<input type="checkbox"/> Formal process in place for continuous progress monitoring and adjustment as reflected in leadership team minutes <input type="checkbox"/> Leading and lagging indicator progress reports (MS Star)
C. Personnel & Professional Development	Examples of Evidence
1. Principal possesses the competencies of a transformation leader	<input type="checkbox"/> Track record of success as evidenced by portfolio, student performance data, and related documentation
2. LEA and school have a process in place for recruiting, placing, and retaining school teachers and leaders with the skills needed for school transformation	<input type="checkbox"/> Board policies that outline recruitment and retention procedures <input type="checkbox"/> Job announcements for positions with SIG school <input type="checkbox"/> Financial incentives and/or opportunities for promotion and career growth <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence in turnaround model of screening existing staff and rehiring no more than 50% <input type="checkbox"/> Interview protocols and procedures for selecting new staff members <input type="checkbox"/> Process for screening and interviewing candidates
3. LEA and school have developed a rigorous and transparent evaluation system with input from teachers and principals that includes evidence of student achievement/growth	<input type="checkbox"/> Publication of evaluation process / documents in faculty handbooks <input type="checkbox"/> Board policy <input type="checkbox"/> Training for teachers and administrators on new evaluation system <input type="checkbox"/> Meeting minutes/sign-in sheets showing teacher and principal input

C. Personnel & Professional Development	Examples of Evidence
4. LEA and school implemented the new evaluation system for principals and teachers	<input type="checkbox"/> LEA memorandum, announcements, rubrics outlining the evaluation criteria <input type="checkbox"/> Schedule/copies of observation assessments of performance, ongoing collections of professional practice documents, documentation of constructive feedback
5. School aligns professional development programs with teacher evaluation results	<input type="checkbox"/> Analysis of teacher evaluation summaries for patterns <input type="checkbox"/> Improvement plans for teachers that include individualized, data-driven professional development
6. LEA and school have a system of rewards for school staff who positively impact student achievement and graduation rates	<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of distribution of rewards (i.e. staff receiving awards, board meeting minutes) <input type="checkbox"/> Board policy for distributing performance based incentives using data to support that performance goals were met <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty handbook, memoranda, policies, and/or staff contract laying out system of rewards
7. LEA and school identify and support school staff who are struggling and remove staff who fail to improve their professional practice	<input type="checkbox"/> Improvement plans, professional growth plans, targeted professional development, mentoring <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty handbook, memoranda, and/or staff contract laying out system of consequences and multiple exit points for employees (voluntary departure, resignation, termination)
8. LEA and school provide induction programs for new teachers and administrators	<input type="checkbox"/> Record of participation in specialized training institutes and leadership academies <input type="checkbox"/> Mentorship programs
9. School provides all staff with high-quality, job-embedded, differentiated professional development to support school improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Professional development opportunities aligned with teacher evaluations and student performance and subgroup needs (e.g., limited proficient students, students with disabilities) <input type="checkbox"/> Learning opportunities aligned with state curriculum standards, and supports the implementation of instructional initiatives (e.g., technology integration, RtI, PBIS, content area programs, increased learning time programs) <input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing conversations/analysis of student work and student data

C. Personnel & Professional Development	Examples of Evidence
	<input type="checkbox"/> Professional development resources/materials provided by LEA to SIG school staff related to school reform model and effective instruction <input type="checkbox"/> Professional development calendar for current school year
10. School monitors extent that professional development changes teacher practice	<input type="checkbox"/> Classroom observation reports on implementation of instructional changes <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation/impact reports from external providers <input type="checkbox"/> Instructional coaching schedules, walk-through observation notes
11. LEA has developed a plan/process to establish a pipeline of potential turnaround leaders	<input type="checkbox"/> Defined criteria and process for recruiting turnaround principals and teachers <input type="checkbox"/> Career ladder/pathways for developing leaders within the district (i.e., mentoring program for new teacher leaders)

D. Curriculum and Instruction	Examples of Evidence
1. LEA and school establish annual goals for student achievement in all core areas	<input type="checkbox"/> Copies of goals for each school in core content areas <input type="checkbox"/> Leading and lagging indicator progress reports
2. LEA and school have a process for the selection of research-based instructional programs/strategies	<input type="checkbox"/> Current written documentation outlining the LEA's criteria and evaluation process for screening and selecting new instructional programs/strategies
3. LEA and school align curriculum, instruction and assessment with state standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Pacing guides, lesson plans showing vertical and horizontal alignment

D. Curriculum and Instruction	Examples of Evidence
4. All teachers routinely assess students' mastery of instructional objectives	<input type="checkbox"/> Meeting notes/minutes from teacher meetings examining student work for understanding (e.g., class work, class tests, projects, homework) <input type="checkbox"/> Progress monitoring tools (e.g., Aims Web, MAPS, STAR, Dibels) <input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive formative assessment/common assessments <input type="checkbox"/> Annual assessment calendar <input type="checkbox"/> Examples of strategies used during lessons to informally assess student learning
5. All teachers adjust instruction based on students' mastery of objectives	<input type="checkbox"/> Assigning students to targeted interventions (whole group, small group, computer based, project based, independent work) <input type="checkbox"/> Differentiating instruction (e.g., lesson plans indicating different levels/concepts of instruction based on individual student needs, learning style profiles, individual learning plans, varying instructional resources)
6. All teachers integrate technology-based interventions and supports into instructional practices	<input type="checkbox"/> Usage reports accompanying computer-based programs <input type="checkbox"/> Lesson plans reflecting technology integration <input type="checkbox"/> Classroom observations of technology use in instruction
7. All teachers provide students with opportunities to enroll in and master rigorous coursework for college and career-readiness	<input type="checkbox"/> Record of participation in advanced coursework, dual enrollment, small learning communities <input type="checkbox"/> Individual graduation plans <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation from graduation coaches, counselors, and/or social workers
8. All teachers incorporate instructional strategies that promote higher-level learning for all students	<input type="checkbox"/> Questioning and discussion techniques to promote higher order thinking (i.e., application level or higher on Bloom's taxonomy or comparable level in Depth of Knowledge [DoK]; facilitation of students' thinking and problem-solving) <input type="checkbox"/> Student projects

D. Curriculum and Instruction	Examples of Evidence
9. All teachers actively engage students in the learning process	<input type="checkbox"/> Observation notes from classroom walk-throughs (i.e., cooperative learning techniques, making lessons relevant to student experiences, differentiation of instruction)
10. All teachers communicate clearly and effectively	<input type="checkbox"/> Observations from classroom walk-throughs (i.e., students respond promptly, teachers check for student understanding) <input type="checkbox"/> Multiple strategies are consistently used to communicate skills/concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Student work reflects clear understanding of tasks
11. All teachers maximize time available for instruction	<input type="checkbox"/> Records of student time on task <input type="checkbox"/> Observations (i.e., maintains pacing and sequence of instruction)
12. All teachers establish and maintain a culture of learning to high expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Observations and lesson plans (i.e., reflecting high level of rigor and engagement in learning, opportunities for self-directed learning, opportunities for all students to participate in learning process)
E. Support Systems/Strategies	Examples of Evidence
1. LEA and district transformation specialists provide intensive, ongoing assistance to support school improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Research-based, school improvement information disseminated to school staff <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation of instructional coaching <input type="checkbox"/> Utilized process for providing continuous feedback to principal, teachers, and leadership teams to facilitate school improvement (MS Star)

E. Support Systems/Strategies	Examples of Evidence
2. LEA and school ensure that external providers deliver intensive, ongoing assistance to support school reform strategies	<input type="checkbox"/> Documentation of instructional coaching and activity logs <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluations of services provided to school <input type="checkbox"/> Quarterly documentation from roundtables with external providers and district/school leadership teams
3. School aligns allocation of resources (money, time, personnel) to school improvement goals	<input type="checkbox"/> School budgets and expenditures aligned with school goals <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation of comprehensive budget planning designed to align funding streams <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation of timely procurement and implementation of resources
4. School accesses innovative partnerships to support extended learning time	<input type="checkbox"/> 21st Century Community Learning Centers <input type="checkbox"/> University partnerships <input type="checkbox"/> Other community partners (e.g., faith-based, boys/girls clubs, retired teachers)
5. School and teachers provide parents with regular communication about learning standards, the progress of their child, and the parents' roles in supporting their child's success in school.	<input type="checkbox"/> Communication with parents through newsletters, emails, telephone calls, individual conferences, school events/activities <input type="checkbox"/> Access to parent centers/training at various times and locations <input type="checkbox"/> Dissemination of student progress reports/report cards
6. School includes parents in decision-making roles for school improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Parent membership and active representation on leadership teams <input type="checkbox"/> Examples of decisions that reflect parent involvement <input type="checkbox"/> Interventions Annual Report

E. Support Systems/Strategies	Examples of Evidence
7. School engages community members in partnerships that benefit students	<input type="checkbox"/> Communicates with community in variety of formats (e.g., public service announcements, forums, newsletters, open-house) <input type="checkbox"/> Community provides internships, job-shadowing for college/career readiness <input type="checkbox"/> Guest instructors from community <input type="checkbox"/> Community members on advisory councils, school leadership teams <input type="checkbox"/> Interventions Annual Report
8. School partners with community groups to provide social-emotional supports for students	<input type="checkbox"/> Health and wellness services which may be provided by community agencies for students (e.g., social workers, mental health facilities, department of human services, health clinics)
9. School implements approaches to improve school climate and discipline	<input type="checkbox"/> Positive behavior supports, bullying prevention programs/activities, safe and orderly schools, character education programs, classroom management strategies

District (LEA) Interview Questions

IMPLEMENTATION:

1. Describe what this school was like before implementing reform efforts as part of the school intervention model.
 - *LEA describes the school prior to SIG funding and before any reform efforts were implemented.*
2. Describe generally your process for implementing the SIG models at the school level.
 - *LEA describes the process for implementing the SIG models in its schools.*
3. Has the LEA made any structural changes to support the implementation of the SIG intervention models? (if applicable)?
 - *LEA describes structural changes made, such as reassignment of duties, creation of turnaround offices, and addition of staff.*
4. How has the LEA addressed the following requirements:
 - Recruited, screened, and selected external partners, if applicable, to ensure their quality?
 - *Current documentation that describes the LEA's process and criteria for approving external providers.*
 - *Contracts/Agreements the LEA has entered into with external partners.*
 - Modified its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement interventions fully and effectively?
 - *LEA describes how it has modified its policies and practices.*
5. What process did you use to replace the principal? When did this occur?
 - *LEA describes its process and timeline for replacing the principal.*
6. What procedures and processes has the LEA implemented to recruit, place, and retain staff with the necessary skills to implement the intervention model selected?
 - *LEA describes its procedures and processes for recruiting, placing, and retaining staff with skills necessary to implement intervention model.*
 - *Job announcements for positions with SIG school.*
7. Where are you in the process of implementing a new teacher evaluation system?
 - *LEA describes where it is in the process of developing its new staff evaluation system and who is involved.*
 - *LEA memorandum, announcements, or rubrics outlining the evaluation system.*
8. What new flexibility has the school been given with regards to model implementation? For example, specifically relating to:

- Staffing?
 - Calendars?
 - Scheduling?
 - Budgeting?
 - *LEA describes new authority it has relating to SIG.*
9. What systems of rewards are in place for staff members who are having a positive impact on student achievement and graduation rates? What systems of support are in place for staff members who may be struggling?
- *Faculty handbook, memorandum, or staff contract that lays out system of reward for staff who are raising student achievement and remediation and consequences for staff who are not raising student achievement.*
10. What types of professional development are being provided to support the implementation of school reform strategies? For example, specifically regarding implementing new instructional programs or strategies, analyzing data, or teaching LEP students?
- *Documentation of professional development activities for the 2010-2011 school year.*
 - *LEA memorandum, announcements, or agendas for professional development meetings.*
 - *Professional development resources and materials provided by LEA to SIG school staff relating to the school reform models and effective instruction.*
11. What instructional programs or instructional strategies are being used in schools? What process did the LEA use to identify the instructional programs or strategies being implemented?
- *Current written documentation outlining the LEA's criteria and evaluation process for screening and selecting new instructional programs or strategies.*

FISCAL:

12. Describe your process and efforts for accounting for the spending of SIG funds.
- *LEA describes its internal accounting and budget review process and the steps it takes to make sure expenditures are allowable.*
13. Did the SEA adjust your proposed budget or did you have to adjust your budget as part of your application?
- *LEA describes any adjustments made to budgets or to programs based on budget adjustments.*
14. Has the LEA submitted any amendments to its application?
- *LEA provides copies of any amendments.*
15. How much of the LEA's SIG award is being used at the district-level to support implementation of the selected school intervention models?
- *LEA budget.*

16. How is the LEA using these funds?
- *LEA describes how funds are being used at the district level.*
 - *Copies of invoices, personnel "runs," etc. that document expenditures of SIG funds.*
17. How is the LEA ensuring that district-level activities conducted with SIG funds are specifically supporting SIG schools?
- *LEA describes its process for ensuring district-level activities are directed toward SIG schools.*
18. How is the LEA ensuring that a school being served with SIG funds is still receiving all the funds that it would have received without the SIG award?
- *LEA describes its process for ensuring that SIG funds do not supplant other funds.*
 - *Comparability reports.*
 - *Documentation of Title I ranking and allocation.*

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE:

19. Are you receiving support or guidance with regard to SIG implementation? If so, describe generally any support or guidance you are receiving regarding SIG?
- *LEA describes any technical assistance it has received from the SEA or other providers.*
 - *Samples of guidance, memoranda, training materials and/or agenda of meetings about SIG that have been provided or been conducted by the SEA particularly relating to the application, budget, intervention model selection, and selection of external providers.*
 - *Informational resources and tool kits, including Web-based resources and materials, provided by the LEA to schools related to the implementation of the SIG models.*
20. With regards to technical assistance, how has the LEA supported, how does it currently support, and how does it plan to support schools in implementing the SIG program?
- *LEA describes any technical assistance it has provided to the schools, including the types, to whom, and how often.*
 - *LEA describes any assistance it is currently providing or plans it has to provide additional technical assistance, including the types, to whom, and how often.*
21. In what areas does the LEA feel it needs to develop its capacity to provide better technical assistance to its schools?
- *LEA describes any areas where it could use additional technical assistance.*
22. Are there other areas where the LEA or its schools implementing SIG models could use additional support or technical assistance?
- *LEA describes any areas where it or its schools could use additional technical assistance.*

MONITORING:

23. How is the LEA ensuring that each SIG school:

- Is fully implementing the selected intervention model?
- Is meeting the requirements of the school's intervention model?
- *LEA describes its process for ensuring that schools are implementing in accordance with the final requirements.*

DATA COLLECTION:

24. What process is the LEA using to collect data on the leading and lagging indicators?

- How is the LEA keeping track of or managing this data?
- How is the LEA using this data to inform its decision- making and reform efforts?
- Is the LEA collecting any additional data beyond that required by the SEA and the SIG program?
- *LEA describes the data it is collecting, its process for collecting the data, and its protocols for managing data on the leading indicators.*

25. Beyond the reporting requirements, does the LEA have any plans for how it will use the data it gathers? If so, please describe those plans.

- *LEA describes its plans for analyzing data and how it is using the data to inform policy decisions and its role in supporting schools.*

26. Have you begun collecting any benchmark or interim data on the indicators? If so, what does the data show thus far?

- *LEA provides copies of and explains any benchmark or interim data it has collected, if available.*

School Leadership Team Interview Questions

IMPLEMENTATION:

1. Describe what this school was like before implementing reform efforts as part of the school intervention model.
 - *School leadership team describes the school prior to the implementation of the SIG model and shares data from the school's needs assessment.*
2. Describe the role of the Leadership Team in implementing the SIG plan.
3. Describe generally what the plan or vision is for implementing the school intervention models to turn around this school and where you are in the process.
 - *School leadership team describes its efforts to implement its particular model in response to the school's needs assessment.*
 - *Implementation timeline submitted as part of the LEA's approved SIG application.*
 - *School leadership team describes any reform efforts that were previously in place.*
 - *School leadership team describes any changes made to its implementation timeline.*

Questions Specifically for the school principal: (#4, 5, 6)

4. How long have you been principal at this school?
 - *Principal provides timeframe of hiring.*
5. How are you and your staff evaluated? How was that system developed?
 - *Faculty handbook, memoranda, or other documentation outlining the criteria and process for teacher evaluation.*
 - *Principal described how system was developed.*
6. Have you been given any new authority with regards to the implementation of your school reform effort? For example with regards to staffing, calendars, scheduling, budgeting?
 - *Principal describes any new authority given for school reform efforts.*
7. What systems of rewards are in place for staff members who are having a positive impact on student achievement and graduation rates? How does the school support teachers who may be struggling?
 - *Faculty handbook, memoranda, or staff contract that lays out system of rewards for staff who are raising student achievement and remediation and consequences for staff who are not raising student achievement.*
 - *Principal describes rewards and consequence system for staff, process for developing system, and rationale for system in place.*

8. What types of professional development or professional support system have been provided by the LEA to support the implementation of school reform strategies? For example, specifically regarding implementing new instructional programs or strategies, analyzing data, or teaching LEP students?
 - *LEA memorandum, announcements, or agendas for professional development meetings.*
 - *Professional development resources and materials provided by LEA to SIG school staff relating to the school reform models and effective instruction.*
9. What instructional programs or instructional strategies are being used? Which of these are new? What process did you use to screen and select the instructional programs or strategies being used?
 - *School leadership team/principal describes process for selecting instructional programs and criteria used.*
 - *Current written documentation outlining the criteria and evaluation process for screening and selecting new instructional programs.*
10. What types of benchmarks have you set to measure progress? What types of data are you collecting to measure these benchmarks?
 - *Principal describes examples of data collected by the school, subject areas, or individual teachers, analysis of data, and how data was used to inform school decisions.*
 - *School leadership team shares any benchmark or interim data collected thus far.*
11. How have you increased the learning time for students?
 - *Current year's and previous year's school schedule.*
12. Describe the impact of increased learning time on student achievement.
13. How were parents and the community engaged in planning to implement the school intervention model?
 - *Letters to parents, fliers, announcements, and agendas and/or minutes from parent/community meetings about the implementation of the transformation model.*
14. What efforts have been made this year to engage families and the community in the school? How is that different from last year?
 - *Principal describes efforts to engage parents and the community.*
15. Do you think a different type of parent involvement is necessary to successfully engage parents and implement the model?
 - *Principal/school leadership team describes what they believe is necessary to successfully engage parents and implement the model.*

16. Is the school implementing other efforts to raise student achievement?

- *Principal/school leadership team describes additional efforts being made to raise student achievement.*

17. How do you know the changes you and the school have made this year are working?

- *School leadership team/principal describes the progress made and provides evidence of progress, for example interim data.*

FISCAL:

18. How are you using SIG funds to support implementation of the SIG model in your school?

- *School leadership team/principal describes how they are using SIG and other funds to support implementation.*

19. In addition to SIG funds, what are the other sources of funds you receive?

- *School level SIG budgets.*

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE:

20. How are the LEA and/or the SEA supporting your implementation of the model?

- *School leadership team/principal describes any support it is receiving from the LEA and/or SEA.*

21. Are there areas where you could use additional technical assistance?

- *School leadership team/principal describes areas where it needs more technical assistance.*

MONITORING:

22. Has anyone from the SEA or LEA visited to see how you are implementing your intervention model?

- *School leadership team/principal describes any monitoring of their intervention that has been or they expect to be conducted by the LEA or SEA.*

DATA COLLECTION:

23. Have you begun collecting any benchmark or interim data on the leading and lagging indicators? If so, what does the data show thus far?

- *School leadership team/principal provides copies of and explains any benchmark or interim data it has collected, if available.*

Teacher Interview Questions

1. Describe generally what you know about the School Improvement Grant program and what that means for your school.
 - *Teachers describe what they know about SIG and/or school-level reforms that have taken place and their role in those reforms.*
2. Generally, what was the school like in previous years or before the reforms? How has it changed, particularly with respect to school culture, expectations of you, and expectations of the students?
 - *Teachers describe own observations and impressions of the impact of reforms in the school.*
3. Were any of you new hires? What process did you go through in applying for your position, being screened, and hired?
 - *Teachers describe hiring process they went through.*
4. Describe the [new] evaluation system that is being developed or that is in place for teachers?
 - *Teachers describe new evaluation process and their role in developing the evaluation system.*
5. Are rewards available to staff for gains in student achievement levels?
 - *Teachers describe reward systems that are in place.*
6. What opportunities are teachers given to make improvements in their practice?
 - *Teachers describe systems in place to support improvements.*
7. Give an example or two of how you have used what you learned through professional development or instructional supports in your classroom.
 - *Teachers describe the various types of professional development and supports they have received including subject, format, and provide examples of how they have used what they learned from professional development.*
8. What new instructional programs or strategies are you using in your class this year?
 - *Teachers describe any new instructional programs/strategies they are using in their classes, how they are being used, and how those programs are impacting student learning.*
9. Give an example of how you are using data to inform your instruction.
 - *Teachers describe what data they are collecting about their students and how they are using the data to inform instruction.*

10. How has your schedule changed from the previous year?

- *Teachers describe how the school has increased learning time, how they use that time, and the impact of increased learning time on student learning.*

11. What efforts have been made this year to engage families and the community in the school? How is this different from previous years?

- *Teachers describe interactions with parents and community.*

12. How do you know the changes you and the school have made this year are working?

- *Teachers describe and provide evidence of how they know the reform efforts are working.*

Parent Interview Questions

1. Are you new to the [school name] community?

For questions #2- 10,

- *Parents describe the changes they have seen in the school as well as their impressions of the school culture and academic expectations.*
 - *Parents describe their involvement in the reform planning efforts.*
2. Describe generally, what you know about the School Improvement Grant program or changes and reforms that have taken place in the school this year.
 3. What was the school like last year? How does that compare to the school this year?
 4. What do your children say about the school?
 5. How did the district or school inform you about the changes that would take place?
 6. Did you have any opportunity to make suggestions on the changes that should be made or give feedback on the changes that would be made?
 7. What programs and supports are provided by the school or school district that help you and your family?
 8. What programs for parents at your school make a positive difference in your child's education (e.g., programs that assist with helping with homework or math and reading nights, etc.)?
 9. How have you been involved in the school this year? For example, volunteering, PTA/PTO membership, school improvement team member, tutor, mentor, etc.)
 10. Does your school have a parent center or parent liaison?

For questions #11- 15,

- *Parents describe the ways the school and teachers communicate with them, how they are involved in the school itself, and how they support their child's education.*
11. How does the school communicate with you (e.g., newsletters, conference, telephone calls, emails, flyers, and websites)? What information do they provide? How frequently do you have communication from the school?
 12. How often do you communicate with your child's teacher(s) about your child's progress in school? In what format?

Appendix B

13. What would you suggest to improve communication and information sharing that would make things easier for parents and students?
14. How are you and other parents encouraged to attend parent meetings and other parent activities?
15. How could the school be more welcoming and open to families and the community?

Student Interview Questions

For these questions,

- *Students describe their overall impressions of the school, including expectations of their performance, levels of engagement, and impressions of safety.*
- *Students describe changes they have noticed between this year and the previous year.*

1. What are the three best things about your school?
2. Are there any things you don't like about your school? If so, what are they? Why?
3. What was your school like last year? What is your school like this year? How does that compare to what the school is like this year?
4. Do your teachers have high expectations for you? How do you know?
5. Do you find your classes interesting and engaging? Give examples of how or how not.
6. Do you feel safe at school? Why or why not?

Indicators of Fiscal Compliance School Improvement Grant

The purpose of this document is to provide schools and districts a framework for compliance requirements for the School Improvement Grant 1003(g) and American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). It serves as a guide for monitoring and support activities conducted by the Mississippi Department of Education. The key components of the document reflect a comprehensive review and alignment with federal regulations, USDE School Improvement Guidance, 2011 OMB Circular A-133 Compliance Supplement, and ARRA regulations. Examples of evidence of implementation at the school-level and at the district-level are provided. Examples of evidence are intended as a “guide” and should not be considered a restricted list.

The following items, at a minimum, should be available for review during the fiscal monitoring visit. (These items will encompass all of the *Examples of Evidence* as noted in the chart below).

- Board minutes
- Copies of approved School Improvement Grant (SIG) application and all related budget amendments
- Personnel information
 - List of SIG personnel
 - Job descriptions
 - Copies of contracts for SIG employees
 - Semi-annual certifications
 - Personnel Activity Reports
 - Time and attendance records
 - Payroll Distribution Report
- Evidence of expenditures
 - LEA purchasing policy and procedures
 - District detail budget report
 - Purchase orders, contracts, invoices, etc. available on site
 - Bids for goods and services
- Evaluation of bids, contracts, and/or awards
 - Request for Proposals with American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) terms and conditions, if applicable
 - Proof of advertisements, including posting to MS bids website and ARRA bids website
 - Evaluation documentation

- Documentation of Board approval of award or contract
 - Contracts with ARRA terms and conditions, if applicable
- Cash Management
 - Documentation to support request for funds
- American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) reporting
 - Documentation to support amounts reported for expenditures, jobs created and jobs retained, vendor jobs, and FTEs
- Fixed Assets
 - Fixed asset listing of equipment purchased with SIG funds by room location

Activities Allowed or Unallowed Allowable Cost/Cost Principles	Examples of Evidence	Comments Reference
1. Is it evident that budgets and expenditures for the School Improvement Grant 1003(g) are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Allocable? b. Reasonable and necessary? c. Meeting program intent and purposes? d. Aligned with the approved application on file at the SEA? e. Obligated and liquidated in accordance with the approved plan within the approved grant period? OMB Circular A-87	<input type="checkbox"/> School Improvement Grant 1003(g) program applications <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of expenditures (district detail budget report, purchase orders, contracts, staffing, invoices, etc.) available on-site <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	
2. Has the LEA submitted amendments to request changes in the School Improvement Grant 1003(g), and was MDE approval granted prior to implementation of program modifications? 34 CFR 80.30	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved amendment form(s) by program	
3. Is it evident that contracts and agreements for products and services are made in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations as well as audit guidelines? 34 CFR 80.36	<input type="checkbox"/> Copies of contracts and agreements <input type="checkbox"/> LEA purchasing policies and procedures	

Activities Allowed or Unallowed Allowable Cost/Cost Principles	Examples of Evidence	Comments Reference
4. Is time and effort documentation available, approved, and signed by appropriate individuals, if applicable? OMB Circular A-87, Appendix B to Part 225, 8(h)	<input type="checkbox"/> List of SIG personnel <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Activity Reports <input type="checkbox"/> Semi-annual certifications <input type="checkbox"/> Job descriptions <input type="checkbox"/> Payroll records <input type="checkbox"/> Work schedules	
5. Are there employees that are partially paid from SIG funds (ARRA or non-ARRA)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Financial records <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	
6. For employees paid from multiple funding sources, do timesheets properly reflect worked performed in each cost objective (SIG ARRA and SIG Non-ARRA) or (SIG and Non-SIG)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Activity Reports <input type="checkbox"/> Job descriptions <input type="checkbox"/> Payroll records <input type="checkbox"/> Work schedules	
7. If salaries are prorated and not paid from one funding source, are benefits prorated based on the funding ratio. Verify a sample of transactions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Payroll records <input type="checkbox"/> Financial records	
8. Does the LEA exercise administrative control and assume responsibility for monitoring the funded programs to ensure compliance with any formal agreements and applicable statutory requirements? 34 CFR 80.40(a)	<input type="checkbox"/> LEA-level person assigned to monitor the program(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Written records/schedules of monitoring visits <input type="checkbox"/> Budget and expenditure reports	

Activities Allowed or Unallowed Allowable Cost/Cost Principles	Examples of Evidence	Comments Reference
<p>This section is not applicable to grants funded with non-ARRA funds.</p> <p>9. Were ARRA funds used to reimburse expenditures made prior to the release of the ARRA funds?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Financial records</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other _____</p>	

Cash Management	Examples of Evidence	Comments Reference
<p>10. Does entity request funds on a reimbursement basis only? If not, does entity either minimize the time elapsing between the transfer of funds and their disbursement or calculate and remit interest earned on advances?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Financial records</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other _____</p>	
<p>11. Determine whether interest earned on advances was reported/ remitted as required.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Financial records</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other _____</p>	
<p>12. Determine by reviewing accounting records and comparing to actual request for funds that the funds drawn were for reimbursement or either for the immediate needs of the district. Immediate need is defined as disbursed within 72 hours of receipt.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Request for funds</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Financial records</p>	

Matching, Level of Effort, Earmarking - Supplement Not Supplant	Examples of Evidence	Comments Reference
---	----------------------	-----------------------

Matching, Level of Effort, Earmarking - Supplement Not Supplant	Examples of Evidence	Comments Reference
13. An LEA that uses SIG funds to serve one or more Title I Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools that operate a schoolwide program, may use SIG funds only to supplement the amount of non-Federal funds that the school would otherwise have received if it were not operating the schoolwide program, including those funds necessary to provide services required by law for students with disabilities and limited English proficient students. Tier I and Tier II schools must operate a schoolwide program to implement one of the SIG school intervention models. However, a school does not need to identify particular children as eligible to participate or demonstrate that SIG funds are used only for activities that supplement those the school would otherwise provide with non-Federal funds (Sections 1114(a)(2)(A)(ii) and (B) of ESEA (20 USC 6314(a)(2)(A)(ii) and (B))).	<input type="checkbox"/> Financial records <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	

Period of Availability	Examples of Evidence	Comments Reference
14. Does the LEA have records to support whether funds were obligated and liquidated within the approved School Improvement grant 1003(g) grant period? OMB Circular A-87	<input type="checkbox"/> Financial records <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	

Period of Availability	Examples of Evidence	Comments Reference
15. Has the LEA submitted amendments to request changes in the categories of the approved grant? 34 CFR Part 80.30	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved amendment form(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	
16. Did the amounts expended during the grant period agree with the activities in the approved application? EDGAR Section 80.20(b)(4)	<input type="checkbox"/> Reference School Improvement grant 1003(g) application <input type="checkbox"/> Expenditure reports <input type="checkbox"/> Purchase orders, invoices, checks, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	
17. Does the LEA maintain separate accounting records of funds made available under the School Improvement Grant 1003(g)? EDGAR Section 80.20(b)(2)	<input type="checkbox"/> Expenditure reports <input type="checkbox"/> Review and observation of accounting procedures <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	

Procurement and Suspension and Debarment	Examples of Evidence	Comments Reference
18. Does the entity have procurement policies that address compliance with applicable Federal requirements (§____.36(b)(1) and 2 CFR section 215.43, and Section 1605 of ARRA).	<input type="checkbox"/> Board policies <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	
19. Does the entity have written procurement policies and procedures that address the following: a. Selection procedures require that solicitations incorporate a clear and accurate description of the technical requirements for the material, product, or	<input type="checkbox"/> Board policies <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	

Procurement and Suspension and Debarment	Examples of Evidence	Comments Reference
<p>service to be procured, identify all requirements that the offerors must fulfill, and include all other factors to be used in evaluating bids or proposals (§____.36(c)(3) and 2 CFR section 215.44(a)(3)).</p> <p>b. Ethical conduct (§____.36(b)(3) and 2 CFR section 215.42).</p>		
<p>20. Does the entity performed a verification check for covered transactions, by checking the EPLS, collecting a certification from the entity, or adding a clause or condition to the covered transaction with the entity; and</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Financial records</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other _____</p>	
<p>21. Test the sample of procurements and sub-awards against the EPLS, and ascertain if covered transactions were awarded to suspended or debarred parties.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Financial records</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other _____</p>	
<p>22. Select a sample of procurements and perform the following:</p> <p>a. Examine contract files and verify that they document the significant history of the procurement, including the rationale for the method of procurement, selection of contract type, contractor selection or rejection, and the basis of contract price (§____.36(b)(9) and 2 CFR section 215.46).</p> <p>b. Verify that procurements provide full and open competition (§____.36(c) (1) and 2 CFR section 215.43).</p> <p>c. Examine documentation in support of the rationale to limit competition in those cases where competition was limited and ascertain if the</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Board minutes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Bid files</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Evaluations of bids</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other _____</p>	

Procurement and Suspension and Debarment	Examples of Evidence	Comments Reference
<p>limitation was justified (§____.36 (b) (1) and (d) (4); and 2 CFR sections 215.43 and 215.44(e)).</p> <p>d. Verify that contract files exist and ascertain if appropriate cost or price analysis was performed in connection with procurement actions, including contract modifications and that this analysis supported the procurement action (§____.36(f) and 2 CFR section 215.45).</p> <p>e. Verify that the Federal awarding agency approved procurements exceeding \$100,000 when such approval was required. Procurements (1) awarded by noncompetitive negotiation, (2) awarded when only a single bid or offer was received, (3) awarded to other than the apparent low bidder, or (4) specifying a "brand name" product (§____.36(g)(2) and 2 CFR 215.44(e)) may require prior Federal awarding agency approval.</p> <p>f. Verify compliance with other procurement requirements specific to the award.</p>		
<p>23. Do contractual services include appropriate ARRA terms and conditions?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Contracts for contractual services</p>	
<p>This section is not applicable to grants funded with non-ARRA funds.</p> <p>24. Select a sample of ARRA-funded procurements, if any, for activities subject to Section 1605 of ARRA and test whether the non-Federal entity has -</p> <p>a. documented that the iron, steel, and manufactured</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Board minutes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Bid files</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Invoices</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other _____</p>	

Procurement and Suspension and Debarment	Examples of Evidence	Comments Reference
<p>goods used in the project are produced in the United States, or</p> <p>b. requested and received any waivers of the Buy-American requirements.</p>		
Reporting	Examples of Evidence	Comments Reference
<p>This section is not applicable to grants funded with non-ARRA funds.</p> <p>25. Review M-09-021 and other relevant guidance issued by OMB since May 2010 for reporting requirements.</p> <p>Determine the methodology used in compiling and reporting the key data elements and ascertain whether the entity passed-through funding to any sub-recipients.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Board minutes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Bid files</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Invoices</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other _____</p>	
<p>This section is not applicable to grants funded with Non-ARRA funds.</p> <p>26. For awards received as a recipient, select the ARRA Section 1512 report for the calendar quarter preceding the entity's year-end, or for a major program with multiple awards (i.e., R&D), select a sample of ARRA Section 1512 reports for the calendar quarter preceding the entity's year-end. For example, the calendar quarter preceding an April 30, May 30, or June 30 entity fiscal year-end would be the quarter ending March 31.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Approved amendment form(s)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other _____</p>	

MS SIG Indicators by Federal Requirements

1. Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model.

B01 – Principal promotes a culture of shared accountability for meeting school improvement performance objectives.

B02 – Principal communicates a compelling vision for school improvement to all stakeholders.

C01 – Principal possesses the competencies of a transformation leader.

2. Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that a) take into account data on student growth as a significant factor as well as other factors, such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high school graduation rates; and b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement.

C02 – LEA and school have a process in place for recruiting, placing, and retaining school teachers and leaders with skills needed for school transformation.

C03 – LEA and school have a rigorous and transparent evaluation system with input from teachers and principals that includes evidence of student achievement/growth.

C04 – LEA and school implemented the new evaluation system for principals and teachers.

3. Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so.

C06 – LEA and school have a system of rewards for school staff that positively impact student achievement and graduation rates.

C07 – LEA and school identify and support school staff that are struggling or remove staff who fail to improve their professional practice.

4. Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies.

A08 – All teachers meet in teams with clear expectations and time for planning.

C05 – School aligns professional development programs with teacher evaluation results.

C08 – LEA and school provide induction programs for new teachers and administrators.

C09 – School provides all staff with high-quality, job-embedded, differentiated professional development to support school improvement.

C10 – School monitors extent that professional development changes teacher practice.

5. Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation model.

C11 – LEA has developed a plan/process to establish a pipeline of potential turnaround leaders.

6. Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with state academic standards.

B04 – School leadership team continuously uses data to drive school improvement.

B05 – Principal continuously monitors the delivery of instruction in all classrooms.

7. Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) in order to inform and differentiate instruction to meet the academic needs of individual students.

B06 – LEA and school leadership teams collect and monitor benchmark/interim data on all SIG leading and lagging indicators.

D01 – LEA and school establish annual goals for student achievement in all core areas.

D02 – LEA and school have a process for the selection of research-based instructional programs/strategies.

D03 – LEA and school align curriculum, instruction, and assessment with state standards.

D04 – All teachers routinely assess students' mastery of instructional objectives.

D05 – All teachers adjust instruction based on students' mastery of objectives.

D06 – All teachers integrate technology-based interventions and supports into instructional practice.

D07 – All teachers provide students with opportunities to enroll in and master rigorous coursework for college and career readiness.

D08 – All teachers incorporate instructional strategies that promote higher-level learning for all students.

D09 – All teachers actively engage students in the learning process.

D10 – All teachers communicate clearly and effectively.

8. Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time.

A09 – LEA and school have increased learning time for all students.

A10 – School continuously evaluates the effectiveness of increased learning time.

D11 – All teachers maximize time available for instruction.

D12 – All teachers establish and maintain a culture of learning to high expectations

E04 – School accesses innovative partnerships to support extended learning time.

9. Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.

E05 – School and teachers provide parents with regular communication about learning standards, the progress of their child, and the parents' roles in supporting their child's success in school.

E06 – School includes parents in decision-making roles for school improvement.

E07 – School engages community members in partnerships that benefit students.

E08 – School partners with community groups to provide social-emotional supports for students.

E09 – School implements approaches to improve school climate and discipline

10. Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates.

A01 – LEA and school conducted a needs assessment to inform the SIG implementation plan.

A02 – LEA personnel are organized and assigned to support schools in their SIG implementation.

A03 – LEA modified policies and practices to support full and effective implementation.

A04 – LEA provides sufficient operational flexibility to the principal to lead transformation or turnaround.

A05 – LEA has established a district turnaround office to support SIG implementation.

11. Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or EMO).

A06 – LEA and school recruit, screen, and select external partners.


A07 – LEA and school clearly specify expectations of external partners in contracts and continuously evaluate their performance.

B03 – School leadership team meets regularly to manage SIG implementation.

E01 – LEA and district transformation specialists provide intensive, ongoing assistance to support school improvement.

E02 – LEA and school ensure that external service providers deliver intensive, ongoing assistance to support school reform strategies.

E03 – School aligns allocation of resources (money, time, personnel) to school improvement goals.



MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Ensuring a bright future for every child

For Additional Information Contact:

Dr. Kim Benton, Bureau Manager

kbenton@mde.k12.ms.us

Linda Reeves, Bureau Director – Finance

lreeves@mde.k12.ms.us

Deborah Hartzog, Special Projects Officer

dhartzog@mde.k12.ms.us

Office of School Recovery

P.O. Box 771, Suite 213

Jackson, MS 39205-0771

<http://mde.k12.ms.us>

601-359-1003

The SIG Monitoring and Accountability Plan was developed in collaboration with Erin McCann, PhD, Southeast Comprehensive Center at SEDL, 4700 Mueller Blvd., Austin, Texas, 78723, (800) 476-6861

Attachment 8b1. Improvement Indicators

CII Code	CII Indicator (Wise Ways Reference)	Key Indicator (Focus)	SpEd	ELL	Others <AMOs	CII IIA
	School Leadership and Decision Making - Establishing a team structure with specific duties and time for instructional planning					
ID01	A team structure is officially incorporated into the school improvement plan and school governance policy. (36)	X			X	IP-1
ID02	All teams have written statements of purpose and by-laws for their operation. (37)	X				
ID03	All teams operate with work plans for the year and specific work products to produce. (38)	X			X	
ID04	All teams prepare agendas for their meetings. (39)	X				IP-1
ID05	All teams maintain official minutes of their meetings. (40)	X				IP-1
ID06	The principal maintains a file of the agendas, work products, and minutes of all teams. (41)	X			X	
ID07	A Leadership Team consisting of the principal, teachers who lead the Instructional Teams, and other key professional staff meets regularly (twice a month or more for an hour each meeting). (42)	X			X	
ID08	The Leadership Team serves as a conduit of communication to the faculty and staff. (43)	X				
ID10	The school's Leadership Team regularly looks at school performance data and aggregated classroom observation data and uses that data to make decisions about school improvement and professional development needs. (45)	X			X	
ID11	Teachers are organized into grade-level, grade-level cluster, or subject-area Instructional Teams. (46)	X				IP-1
ID13	Instructional Teams meet for blocks of time (4 to 6 hour blocks, once a month; whole days before and after the school year) sufficient to develop and refine units of instruction and review student learning data. (48)	X		X	X	IP-1
	School Leadership and Decision Making - Focusing the principal's role on building leadership capacity, achieving learning goals, and improving instruction					
IE05	The principal participates actively with the school's teams. (56)	X	X		X	

CII Code	CII Indicator (Wise Ways Reference)	Key Indicator (Focus)	SpEd	ELL	Others <AMOs	CII IIA
IE06	The principal keeps a focus on instructional improvement and student learning outcomes. (57)	X			X	
IE07	The principal monitors curriculum and classroom instruction regularly. (58)	X				
IE08	The principal spends at least 50% of his/her time working directly with teachers to improve instruction, including classroom observations. (59)	X				
IE09	The principal challenges, supports and monitors the correction of unsound teaching practices. (60)	X				
IE10	The principal celebrates individual, team, and school successes, especially related to student learning outcomes. (61)	X				
IE13	The principal offers frequent opportunities for staff and parents	X				
	School Leadership and Decision Making - Aligning classroom observations with evaluation criteria and professional development					
IF01	The principal compiles reports from classroom observations, showing aggregate areas of strength and areas that need improvement without revealing the identity of individual teachers. (65)	X			X	
IF02	The Leadership Team reviews the principal's summary reports of classroom observations and takes them into account in planning professional development. (66)	X			X	
IF03	Professional development for teachers includes observations by the principal related to indicators of effective teaching and classroom management. (67)					
IF04	Professional development for teachers includes observations by peers related to indicators of effective teaching and classroom management. (68)					
IF05	Professional development for teachers includes self-assessment related to indicators of effective teaching and classroom management. (69)					
IF06	Teachers are required to make individual professional development plans based on classroom observations. (70)					
IF07	Professional development of individual teachers includes an emphasis on indicators of effective teaching. (71)					

CII Code	CII Indicator (Wise Ways Reference)	Key Indicator (Focus)	SpEd	ELL	Others <AMOs	CII IIA
IF08	Professional development for the whole faculty includes assessment of strengths and areas in need of improvement from classroom observations of indicators of effective teaching. (72)			X	X	
IF10	The principal plans opportunities for teachers to share their strengths with other teachers. (74)					
	Curriculum, Assessment, and Instructional Planning - Engaging teachers in aligning instruction with standards and benchmarks					
IIA01	Instructional Teams develop standards-aligned units of instruction for each subject and grade level. (88)	X	X	X	X	IP-2
IIA02	Units of instruction include standards-based objectives and criteria for mastery. (89)	X			X	IP-2
	Curriculum, Assessment, and Instructional Planning - Engaging teachers in assessing and monitoring student mastery					
IIB01	Units of instruction include pre-/post-tests to assess student mastery of standards-based objectives. (91)	X			X	IP-2
IIB02	Unit pre-tests and post-tests are administered to all students in the grade level and subject covered by the unit of instruction. (92)	X	X		X	
IIB03	Unit pre-test and post-test results are reviewed by the Instructional Team. (93)	X	X		X	IP-2
IIB04	Teachers individualize instruction based on pre-test results to provide support for some students and enhanced learning opportunities for others. (94)	X	X	X	X	
IIB05	All teachers re-teach based on post-test results. (95)	X				
	Curriculum, Assessment, and Instructional Planning - Engaging teachers in differentiating and aligning learning activities					
IIC01	Units of instruction include specific learning activities aligned to objectives. (96)	X			X	IP-2
IIC03	Materials for standards-aligned learning activities are well-organized, labeled, and stored for convenient use by teachers. (98)					IP-4
	Curriculum, Assessment, and Instructional Planning - Assessing student learning frequently with standards-based assessments					

CII Code	CII Indicator (Wise Ways Reference)	Key Indicator (Focus)	SpEd	ELL	Others <AMOs	CII IIA
IID02	The school tests each student at least 3 times each year to determine progress toward standards-based objectives. (100)		X			
IID03	Teachers receive timely reports of results from standardized and objectives-based tests. (101)					
IID06	Yearly learning goals are set for the school by the Leadership Team, utilizing student learning data. (104)			X		
IID07	The Leadership Team monitors school-level student learning data. (105)					
IID08	Instructional Teams use student learning data to assess strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum and instructional strategies. (106)		X	X	X	IP-2
IID09	Instructional Teams use student learning data to plan instruction. (107)		X		X	IP-3
IID10	Instructional Teams use student learning data to identify students in need of instructional support or enhancement. (108)		X		X	IP-3
IID11	Instructional Teams review the results of unit pre-/post-tests to make decisions about the curriculum and instructional plans and to "red flag" students in need of intervention (both students in need of tutoring or extra help and students needing enhanced learning opportunities because of their early mastery of objectives). (109)					IP-3
	Classroom Instruction - Expecting and monitoring sound instruction in a variety of modes - Preparation					
IIIA01	All teachers are guided by a document that aligns standards, curriculum, instruction, and assessment. (110)					IP-4
IIIA02	All teachers develop weekly lesson plans based on aligned units of instruction. (111)					IP-4
IIIA05	All teachers maintain a record of each student's mastery of specific learning objectives. (114)					
IIIA06	All teachers test frequently using a variety of evaluation methods and maintain a record of the results. (115)			X		IP-4
IIIA07	All teachers differentiate assignments (individualize instruction) in response to individual student performance on pre-tests and other methods of assessment. (116)			X	X	IP-4

CII Code	CII Indicator (Wise Ways Reference)	Key Indicator (Focus)	SpEd	ELL	Others <AMOs	CII IIA
	Classroom Instruction - Expecting and monitoring sound instruction in a variety of modes - Teacher-Directed Whole-Class or Small Group Instruction - Introduction					
IIIA08	All teachers review the previous lesson. (117)					ID
IIIA09	All teachers clearly state the lesson's topic, theme, and objectives. (118)					ID
IIIA10	All teachers stimulate interest in the topics. (119)					ID
IIIA11	All teachers use modeling, demonstration, and graphics. (120)					ID
	Classroom Instruction - Expecting and monitoring sound instruction in a variety of modes - Teacher-Directed Whole-Class or Small Group Instruction - Presentation					
IIIA13	All teachers explain directly and thoroughly. (122)					ID
IIIA14	All teachers maintain eye contact. (123)					ID
IIIA15	All teachers speak with expression and use a variety of vocal tones. (124)					ID
IIIA16	All teachers use prompting/cueing. (125)					ID
	Classroom Instruction - Expecting and monitoring sound instruction in a variety of modes - Teacher-Directed Whole-Class or Small Group Instruction - Summary and Confirmation of Learning					
IIIA17	All teachers re-teach when necessary. (126)					ID
IIIA18	All teachers review with drilling/class recitation. (127)					ID
IIIA19	All teachers review with questioning. (128)					ID
IIIA20	All teachers summarize key concepts. (129)					ID
	Classroom Instruction - Expecting and monitoring sound instruction in a variety of modes - Teacher-Student Interaction					
IIIA21	All teachers re-teach following questioning. (130)					
IIIA25	All teachers encourage students to paraphrase, summarize, and relate. (134)					ID
IIIA26	All teachers encourage students to check their own comprehension. (135)					ID
IIIA27	All teachers verbally praise students. (136)					ID
	Classroom Instruction - Expecting and monitoring sound instruction in a variety of modes - Student-Directed Small-Group and Independent Work					
IIIA28	All teachers travel to all areas in which students are working. (137)					ID

CII Code	CII Indicator (Wise Ways Reference)	Key Indicator (Focus)	SpEd	ELL	Others <AMOs	CII IIA
IIIA31	All teachers interact instructionally with students (explaining, checking, giving feedback). (140)					ID
IIIA32	All teachers interact managerially with students (reinforcing rules, procedures). (141)					ID
IIIA33	All teachers interact socially with students (noticing and attending to an ill student, asking about the weekend, inquiring about the family). (142)					ID
	Classroom Instruction - Expecting and monitoring sound instruction in a variety of modes - Computer-Based Instruction					
IIIA35	Students are engaged and on task. (144)					ID
IIIA40	All teachers assess student mastery in ways other than those provided by the computer program. (149)					ID
	Classroom Instruction - Expecting and monitoring sound homework practices and communication with parents					
IIIB01	All teachers maintain a file of communication with parents. (150)	X				ID
IIIB02	All teachers regularly assign homework (4 or more days a week). (151)	X				ID
IIIB03	All teachers check, mark, and return homework. (152)	X				ID
IIIB06	All teachers systematically report to parents the student's mastery of specific standards-based objectives. (155)	X	X	X		ID
	Classroom Instruction - Expecting and monitoring sound classroom management					
IIIC01	When waiting for assistance from the teacher, students are occupied with curriculum-related activities provided by the teacher. (156)					CM
IIIC04	Students raise hands or otherwise signal before speaking. (159)					
IIIC05	All teachers use a variety of instructional modes. (160)					CM
IIIC06	All teachers maintain well-organized student learning materials in the classroom. (161)					CM
IIIC08	All teachers display classroom rules and procedures in the classroom. (163)					CM
IIIC09	All teachers correct students who do not follow classroom rules and procedures. (164)					CM
IIIC10	All teachers reinforce classroom rules and procedures by positively teaching them. (165)					CM