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Letter from the State Superintendent of Education

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

Dear Madam Secretary:

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Carey M. Wright, Ed.D.  
State Superintendent
Executive Summary
The Mississippi Department of Education is charged with supporting local school districts to help them to attain the Mississippi State Board of Education’s vision and goals. The Board’s bold vision for a world-class education system and the agency’s philosophy of operating in the best interest of students drive the MDE’s work.

**Mission:** To provide leadership through the development of policy and accountability systems so that all students are prepared to compete in the global economy

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

Mississippi’s leaders use this mission and vision not only for aspiration, but also for inspiration. Talking with leaders, teachers, and parents throughout the state yields a common desire for students to achieve in school, but also to be happy in learning the history, art, culture, and music of their home state. They want Mississippi’s children to be prepared and confident to pursue careers and choices that enable them to be their best in Mississippi, to have families they can provide for, enrich their communities with skills and contributions, advocate for the laws and policies that represent their values, and to be able to enjoy the quality of life they know in Mississippi.

Figuring out how to connect this aspiration to the plans itself is the work of the Mississippi State Board of Education. With the Strategic Plan 2016-2020, the State Board of Education sets the roadmap for improving public education in Mississippi. The plan describes the objectives and strategies the MDE employs to help local school districts achieve the Board’s vision and goals. The Board’s goals were created in 2014 and affirmed in 2016.
1 - All students proficient and showing growth in all assessed areas

- Implement the Literacy-Based Promotion Act with fidelity
- Continue implementing the MS College and Career Readiness Standards

2 - Every student graduates from high school and is ready for college and career

- All students enter Mississippi colleges prepared for credit-bearing courses
- All students graduate prepared for careers, meeting academic and employability standards
- Increase the number and percentage of students participating in and successfully completing advanced coursework, including AP, dual enrollment, articulated credit, STEM pathways and national certifications

3 - Every child has access to a high-quality early childhood program

- Define a high-quality early childhood model and share the model with all stakeholders
- Increase access to high-quality early childhood programs

4 - Every school has effective teachers and leaders

- Increase the percentage of educators rated Effective or above on the state evaluation systems
- Raise the academic standards in Mississippi teacher-preparation programs

5 - Every community is effectively using a world-class data system to improve student outcomes

- Modernize current student information system to become a state-of-the-art data system
- Revise the Office of Technology and Strategic Services plan

6 - Every school and district is rated "C" or higher

- Improve academic outcomes in Targeted Support and Improvement Schools and Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools
- Improve academic outcomes in schools under conservatorship
- Establish an Achievement School District (ASD)

Purpose of this Plan

The purpose of this plan is to connect these goals to the strategies and activities undertaken by the MDE and local school districts to prepare students for college and career. Sections include information and data about current performance, the numbers and context regarding achievement targets, details about the initiatives designed to help Mississippi’s students achieve those ambitious targets, and finally information about the federal programs that support Mississippi’s vision for student success.

The MDE seeks feedback from parents and guardians, business people, school leaders, and community members to best align plans and resources to help Mississippi’s children be prepared to lead their home state as citizens, workers, family members, and community members.

Mississippi Student Achievement with MAP

Mississippi’s students are as capable as any other group of students across the country. Yet, despite the dedication and hard work of teachers and school leaders across the state, student achievement results place the state near the bottom of many education rankings.

Student achievement in Mississippi is low, with about 30% of students scoring proficient and advanced on state tests. Mississippi has been through two assessment changes in the last three years (MCT2 to PARCC to MAP). On both the PARCC and MAP assessments, Mississippi’s students scored fairly low as
a result of more rigorous standards and assessments. Recent assessment performance is much more in line with Mississippi’s performance on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) than prior state assessments. The new assessments address the “honesty gap” of student knowledge and abilities in comparison with student scores through better aligning high expectations with meaningful cut-off scores for proficiency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English Language Arts</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English II</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algebra I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**National Student Achievement Comparison with NAEP**

Mississippi students also participate in the NAEP assessment each year. Known as “The Nation’s Report Card,” the NAEP assessment results provide a meaningful comparison among states for student achievement.

Mississippi showed a significant increase in 4th grade math and reading in the 2015 administration, countering the national trend of flat or declining performance. Compared to 2013 scores, Mississippi was the only state that had a significant increase in 4th grade math, and was one of thirteen states that showed an increase in 4th grade reading. Since implementing Mississippi College and Career Ready standards starting in the 2011-12 school year, Mississippi’s students have demonstrated steady growth on national measures.
College and Career Readiness with the ACT Assessment

Mississippi’s Class of 2016 was the first class with all students required to take the ACT. The decision to administer the ACT to all 11th graders was rooted in Mississippi’s commitment to equity. The ACT measures college readiness and student achievement in high school. Of the 18 states that require all students to participate in the ACT, Mississippi’s scores were higher than only Nevada’s. Only 10.5% of students met benchmark scores in all four testing areas, as opposed to 26% nationwide.
Scores from the first statewide administration of the ACT in 2015 went up with the second administration. The first class to take the assessment scored 17.6 in 2015, and the second class, the Class of 2017, rated an 18.3 composite score. This is still below the national composite average of 20.8, measured on a scale from one to thirty-six.

District-wide ACT averages have improved, as nineteen districts had an average ACT composite score of 20 or higher in 2016, compared to nine districts with those scores in 2015.

**Mississippi’s High School Graduation Rate is Climbing**

The four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (ACGR) is one of Mississippi’s most significant areas of growth over the last few years. The graduation rate has grown from 73.7% in 2012 to 82.3% in 2017. The graduation rate for students with disabilities increased significantly to 34.7% from 22.5% during the same timeframe. The dropout rate decreased from 16.7% in 2012 to 10.8% in 2017, another significant move in the right direction. Mississippi is seeing positive results, largely in part due to focused professional development related to higher standards of learning and multiple pathways by which students can receive a diploma.
English Learner Population Growing as Mississippi Grows More Diverse

As a state, Mississippi is educating a growing number of English language learners. The state’s EL population is still quite small, with 8100 EL students in 2012, trending up to 12,000 in 2017, making the EL population roughly 2.5% of all students. EL standards were implemented in 20XX, and the LAS Links assessment has been used to measure English language acquisition since 20XX.

College Enrollment and Remediation

College enrollment among Mississippi high school graduates is steady. As reported by Mississippi’s LifeTracks system, enrollment in public universities has increased slightly from 17.4% of students enrolling in 2012 to 17.8% of students enrolling in 2015, while enrollment in Mississippi community colleges has declined slightly, with just under half of high school graduates enrolling in community college programs. This student enrollment rate does not include enrollment in private colleges or out-of-state universities. Mississippi’s percentage of 67.6% is very close to the national average of 68.4% of students enrolling in community college, private colleges or universities, or public universities, according to the National Center for Education Statistics.
School and District Accountability Scores Shift Due to Higher Standards

Accountability and transparency are important values for the MDE and local school districts, and the MDE demonstrates this commitment through publishing scores for each school and district in the state. These ratings are issued annually and are based on a combination of academic achievement and academic growth in math, reading, science, and history, and include a measure of growth for the lowest-performing 25% of students. At the high school level, accountability measures also include graduation rate, scores on ACT sections, and college and career readiness.

Mississippi’s school-level accountability standards increased substantially for the 2015-16 school year, based on the implementation of the Mississippi Assessment Program and more rigorous cut points. As a result, results were lower for 2016 than in previous years. In addition, the MDE instituted a process for sharing improvement strategies among the “F” rated schools, designed to build awareness of school-wide issues and connection among board members, district leadership, school leaders, teachers, parents, and community members.
Long-Term Goals and Interim Benchmarks

Leaders in Mississippi's districts and schools know that setting specific targets will enable their students to be prepared for college and career. Setting targets from access to high-quality early childhood programs for our youngest learners, to NAEP and MAP scores for middle years’ students, to graduation and college enrollment for students at the end of the PK-12 continuum provide the opportunity to engage students, parents, community members, teachers, school leaders, and state leaders in conversation and work to help all Mississippi’s students achieve these goals.

Early Childhood Program Quality Long-Term Goals and Interim Benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Baseline Number</th>
<th>Interim Targets</th>
<th>Long-term Program Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2015-2016 TBD%</td>
<td>2018-2019 TBD%</td>
<td>2024-2025 TBD%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2021-2022 TBD%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

English Language Proficiency Long-Term Goals and Interim Benchmarks
### Mississippi Assessment Program Long-Term Goals and Interim Benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Baseline Score</th>
<th>Interim Targets</th>
<th>Long-term LAS Links Score Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2015-2016 TBD%</td>
<td>2018-2019 TBD%</td>
<td>2024-2025 TBD%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Interim ELA Targets</th>
<th>Interim Math Targets</th>
<th>Long-term Proficient Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2015-2016 ELA 32.6%</td>
<td>2018-2019 45.1%</td>
<td>2018-2019 44.1%</td>
<td>2024-2025 ELA 70.0% Math 70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015-2016 Math 31.1%</td>
<td>2021-2022 57.5%</td>
<td>2021-22 57.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### High School Graduation Long-Term Goals and Interim Benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Class of 2016</th>
<th>Interim Targets</th>
<th>Long-term Graduation Rate Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>2018-2019 TBD%</td>
<td>2024-2025 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2019-2022 TBD%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ACT Long-Term Goals and Interim Benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Baseline Composite Score</th>
<th>Interim Targets</th>
<th>Long-term ACT Composite Score Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2015-2016 18.4</td>
<td>2017-2018 TBD</td>
<td>2024-2025 TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018-2019 TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2019-2025 TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NAEP Proficiency Long-Term Goals and Interim Benchmarks

TBD

School Accountability Rating Long-Term Goals and Interim Benchmarks

TBD

Current Initiatives and Recommendations to Attain Goals of Mississippi Achieves Plan

Expanding Access to High-Quality Early Childhood Education

Mississippi’s students start on the track to college and career readiness in early childhood. The MDE has prioritized investment in providing access to high quality early childhood programs. In 2015, 59% of preschool children in an Early Learning Collaborative demonstrated readiness for kindergarten, and in 2016, 71% of preschool students met this readiness indicator. This is in contrast to the statewide readiness rate that hovers at 1 in 3 students. Providing high-quality early childhood options are central to the MDE strategy, and as a result, every program is rated annually via an Effectiveness Evaluation Plan that examines classroom interaction as well as student outcomes.

![3 - Every child has access to a high-quality early childhood program](image)
- Define a high-quality early childhood model and share the model with all stakeholders
- Increase access to high-quality early childhood programs

Focusing on Grade-Level Reading

Learning to read is the focus for grades K-3, as reading to learn is the goal thereafter. The MDE has invested in encouraging early elementary teachers, literacy specialists, special education teachers, and other interventionists to collaborate in understanding and serving student needs.

In the spring of 2016, 63% of Kindergarteners met or exceeded the end-of-year target score on the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment that categorizes them as transitional readers. This is an increase from 54% in 2015, and a significant increase from the fall readiness rate that has hovered around 35% for several years. In other words, statewide, 1 in 3 students enter kindergarten with the requisite skills to learn kindergarten content, but almost 2 in 3 students exit with the skills needed for 1st grade. For 3rd graders, 87% of students passed the 3rd grade Reading Assessment on their first try, which is an increase from 85% in 2015. After the final administration, 92% of students passed. This rate does not equate to proficiency, but the expectations for promotion under the law will increase during the 2018-19 school year.

Literacy coaches have been critical to achieving this growth over the last few years. With the goal of helping teachers better teach the building blocks to reading, this focused intervention in the highest need schools is valued by school leaders and teachers, and has positive results with early readers.
Expanding Access to ACT for all 11th graders

The decision to administer the ACT assessment for all 11th graders was rooted in a commitment to equity. The ACT is a gateway assessment to higher education opportunities, and when high school students are prepared with a score, they have one fewer barrier to application, enrollment, and matriculation in a variety of programs. Numbers of tested students went from X to Y, and more importantly, the demographics of students assessed went from X to Y. The average composite score increased from 17.6 in 2015 to 18.3 in 2016, and the percentage of students meeting ACT benchmarks scores in all four subject areas also increased from 9% to 11%.

While state-wide assessment outcomes are lower than desired, the higher expectations of a college entry exam paired with transparency and clarity about student achievement will enable schools and districts to map paths to improvement in instruction, as well.

Expanding Access to AP Courses

Enabling access to college-level content is another way that Mississippi schools are eliminating barriers to high achievement in higher ed. Through raising awareness of AP benefits, increasing access to classes, and providing focused professional development for teachers, principals, and counselors, Mississippi saw growth in all three major categories of Advanced Placement (AP) participation and performance. There was a 23.1% increase in the number of students enrolled in AP courses, a 22.8% increase in the number of exams taken, and 11.1% increase in the number of students achieving qualifying AP scores. More specifically, there has been a 37.9% increase in the number of minority students taking AP exams.
Ensuring Transparency with School and District Grades

A key MDE function is to assess and communicate the quality of every public school and district. By measuring student achievement and growth for all grades, graduation rate and college and career readiness for high schools, and isolating the growth of the lowest-performing student groups in the school, the MDE compares performance to objective measures and provides an A-F rating for each school and district each year. Schools use these ratings to understand their relative performance and identify opportunities to improve, and district and the MDE use these ratings to reward and replicate high-performing schools and identify schools in need of intervention. These annual ratings are published on an MDE website, and districts have the opportunity to publish additional information about their schools’ performance as well. Parents and community members can look up the rating of any school or district in the state and identify the drivers for the rating, and use this information to commend performance or recommend changes. The goal is for every school to be rated “C” or higher on this criterion-based system.

Incenting Flexibility with Districts of Innovation Competitive Grant

Need help here.

Investing in Career & Technical Education

Economic development professionals and school leaders across the country are known to say that today’s career and technical education (CTE) is “high tech, not vo-tech.” Vocational education, initiated by the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, was focused on skilled trades, home economics, and agriculture. Mississippi’s leaders, driven by a desire to prepare the workforce for the jobs of today and tomorrow, have shifted that focus instead to transportation & logistics, hospitality & tourism, health sciences, engineering & advanced manufacturing, education, and Mississippi’s mainstay, agriculture.

Career and Technical Education provides for middle and high school students with access to companies in Mississippi’s leading industries and training to prepare them for livable wage careers. The sweet spot of
“middle skill” roles, those that require more skills than a high school diploma but not a four-year degree, provide stable opportunities to young people to engage in the economy and build a career in Mississippi.

Research from the University of Mississippi cites 131,461 students from all 144 school districts across the state are enrolled in CTE courses. CTE students’ performance is frequently measured by performance-based assessments, and 77% of teachers reported that these assessments accurately measured students’ skills and achievements. More importantly, students enrolled in CTE courses achieve a graduation rate of 91%, higher than the Mississippi or national averages. Eight-three percent of CTE students have scored on grade level in math, and 84% achieve a credential, certificate, or degree.

### 2 - Every student graduates from high school and is ready for college and career

- All students enter Mississippi colleges prepared for credit-bearing courses
- All students graduate prepared for careers, meeting academic and employability standards
- Increase the number and percentage of students participating in and successfully completing advanced coursework, including AP, dual enrollment, articulated credit, STEM pathways and national certifications

### Expanding Personal Development and Leadership Opportunities to Teachers and Administrators

The Mississippi legislature appropriated approximately $1M annually for professional development related to teaching reading and the effective implementation of the Mississippi College and Career Ready Standards. According to an independent report from the Southern Regional Education Board, the MDE sets strong expectations for high-quality professional learning for all educators and provides essential support for school districts. Professional development initiatives include free, on-demand training for schools and districts, expanded professional development calendar and menu of services, courses for curriculum directors, and interagency convenings to support academic initiatives among school attendance officers, literacy coaches, school improvement coaches, professional development coordinators and other personnel.

### 4 - Every school has effective teachers and leaders

- Increase the percentage of educators rated Effective or above on the state evaluation systems
- Raise the academic standards in Mississippi teacher preparation programs

### Supports to Struggling Schools

Need help here

### 6 - Every school and district is rated "C" or higher

- Improve academic outcomes in Targeted Support and Improvement Schools and Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools
- Improve academic outcomes in schools under conservatorship
- Establish an Achievement School District (ASD)

1. What you can do to invest in improving public schools
   a. Provide comments (during June / July window) (and method)
   b. Stay informed on updates (i.e., blog, councils, meetings)
c. Get involved (i.e., volunteer locally, serve on school boards)
d. Host a meeting in your community or through your civic organization
Programs Included in the Consolidated State Plan

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

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

or

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

☐ Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies

☐ Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children

☐ Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk

☐ Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction

☐ Title III, Part A: English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement

☐ Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants

☐ Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers

☐ Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program

☐ Title VII, Subpart B of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act: Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program (McKinney-Vento Act)
A. Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)

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

1. **Challenging State Academic Standards and Assessments** (*ESEA section 1111(b)(1) and (2) and 34 CFR §§ 200.1–200.8.*)

2. **Eighth Grade Math Exception** (*ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C) and 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4)):**
   i. Does the State administer an end-of-course mathematics assessment to meet the requirements under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA?
      X Yes
      ☐ No
   
   ii. If a State responds “yes” to question 2(i), does the State wish to exempt an eighth-grade student who takes the high school mathematics course associated with the end-of-course assessment from the mathematics assessment typically administered in eighth grade under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(aa) of the ESEA and ensure that:
      a. The student instead takes the end-of-course mathematics assessment the State administers to high school students under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA;
      b. The student’s performance on the high school assessment is used in the year in which the student takes the assessment for purposes of measuring academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) of the ESEA and participation in assessments under section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the ESEA;
      c. In high school:
         1. The student takes a State-administered end-of-course assessment or nationally recognized high school academic assessment as defined in 34 CFR § 200.3(d) in mathematics that is more advanced than the assessment the State administers under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA;
         2. The State provides for appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR § 200.6(b) and (f); and
         3. The student’s performance on the more advanced mathematics assessment is used for purposes of measuring academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) of the ESEA and participation in assessments under section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the ESEA.
      X Yes
      ☐ No
   
   iii. If a State responds “yes” to question 2(ii), consistent with 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4), describe, with regard to this exception, its strategies to provide all students in the State the opportunity to be prepared for and to take advanced mathematics coursework in middle school.

---

1 The Secretary anticipates collecting relevant information consistent with the assessment peer review process in 34 CFR § 200.2(d). An SEA need not submit any information regarding challenging State academic standards and assessments at this time.
The Mississippi Assessment Program (MAP) administers an end-of-course assessment for high school students aligned to the academic content standards for Algebra I. The end-of-course assessment is administered in December (for schools on a 4x4 block schedule) and again in April for all high school students. The data from the 2016 suggest 9,777 students participated in the December 2016 administration. In the spring, 45,093 students participated in the Algebra I assessment, including those students retesting because they did not attain a “passing” score in an earlier administration.

The Mississippi Assessment Program (MAP) also provides the opportunity for 8th grade students to take the Algebra I assessment before entering high school. In 2016, 2,737 8th graders participated in the Algebra I assessment. Under the new requirements of ESSA, 8th grade students who take Algebra I in the 8th grade will now have to take a high school math assessment. At the time of this writing, a high school assessment above Algebra I has not yet been developed. The Office of Student Assessment plans to create an Algebra II assessment for these students who take Algebra I in the 8th grade. The Algebra II assessment will be aligned to the Mississippi College and Career Readiness Algebra II Standards. The Office of Student Assessment plans to field test Algebra II items in the spring of 2018, which will allow an operational Algebra II assessment to be administered in the Fall of 2018 for students on a 4x4 block schedule, and the Spring of 2019 for students on a traditional schedule.

3. **Native Language Assessments (ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(F) and 34 CFR § 200.6(f)(2)(ii)):**
   
   i. Provide its definition for “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population,” and identify the specific languages that meet that definition.

   Mississippi is an English-only state, as dictated by state law. As such instruction in the public schools is conducted in English, and the SEA does not have a definition or threshold for determining the languages, beyond English, that are present to a significant extent. We do, however, collect home language information when students take the English language proficiency assessment. Based on home language survey information, the most common non-English language present in Mississippi is Spanish.

   Given that many of Mississippi’s students who have a native language other than English do not have strong academic vocabulary in their native language due to interruption in formal schooling or lack of prior formal education, MDE’s Office of Student Assessment creates state assessments in English only. Mississippi Code 3-3-31 (2013) states “The English language is the official language of the State of Mississippi.” Fewer than 2% of Mississippi public school students identify as English learners. As a result, MDE does not presently identify any languages other than English.

   ii. Identify any existing assessments in languages other than English, and specify for which grades and content areas those assessments are available.
Mississippi does not offer existing assessments in languages other than English.

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

Presently yearly student academic assessments are not available in Spanish.

iv. Describe how it will make every effort to develop assessments, at a minimum, in languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population including by providing
a. The State’s plan and timeline for developing such assessments, including a description of how it met the requirements of 34 CFR § 200.6(f)(4);

b. A description of the process the State used to gather meaningful input on the need for assessments in languages other than English, collect and respond to public comment, and consult with educators; parents and families of English learners; students, as appropriate; and other stakeholders; and

c. As applicable, an explanation of the reasons the State has not been able to complete the development of such assessments despite making every effort.

Mississippi is an English-only state, as dictated by state law. As such instruction in the public schools is conducted in English, and assessments are not being developed in other languages.

4. **Statewide Accountability System and School Support and Improvement Activities (ESEA section 1111(c) and (d));**

   i. **Subgroups (ESEA section 1111(c)(2));**

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

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

- Economically disadvantaged students
- Children with disabilities
- English learners
- Alaskan Native or Native American
- Black or African-American
- Hispanic / Latino
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- White
- Two or More Races

Subgroup proficiency data will be used as a means of identifying schools for Targeted Support and Improvement.
b. If applicable, describe any additional subgroups of students other than the statutorily required subgroups (i.e., economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, children with disabilities, and English learners) used in the Statewide accountability system.

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

c. Does the State intend to include in the English learner subgroup the results of students previously identified as English learners on the State assessments required under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) for purposes of State accountability (ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(B))? Note that a student’s results may be included in the English learner subgroup for not more than four years after the student ceases to be identified as an English learner.
   ☑ Yes
   ☐ No

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

   Not applicable.

ii. Minimum N-Size (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A)):
a. Provide the minimum number of students that the State determines are necessary to be included to carry out the requirements of any provisions under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that require disaggregation of information by each subgroup of students for accountability purposes.

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

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

The minimal n-count of 10 is used to protect personally identifiable information from being unintentionally disclosed. This minimum affects the calculation of the lowest 25% indicators for the accountability model; however, 17 out of 882 schools did not have at least 10 students in the lowest 25% indicator. Mississippi does not use statistical sampling in accountability data, rather the full population is used. Using an n-count of 10 ensures maximum inclusion of students in the accountability system without undermining student privacy.

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

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

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

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

Before ESEA Flexibility, Mississippi's accountability system required an n-count of 40 for data to be included for a given subgroup. Under the old 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 new model, less than 2% of schools had fewer than 10 students in the "low 25%" subgroup during the 2015-16 school year.

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

When the number of students reporting scores is below 10, scores are suppressed. Also, any percentage value below 5% or higher than 98% is suppressed.

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

Minimum reporting value is also 10.

iii. Establishment of Long-Term Goals (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)):

a. Academic Achievement. (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(aa))

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

Mississippi leaders and stakeholders in the ESSA Advisory Committee believe that a 10-year timeline for long-term goals is

2 Consistent with ESEA section1111(i), information collected or disseminated under ESEA section 1111 shall be collected and disseminated in a manner that protects the privacy of individuals consistent with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g, commonly known as the “Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974”). When selecting a minimum n-size for reporting, States should consult the Institute for Education Sciences report “Best Practices for Determining Subgroup Size in Accountability Systems While Protecting Personally Identifiable Student Information” to identify appropriate statistical disclosure limitation strategies for protecting student privacy.
appropriate, as 3rd graders in the first year of data will be 12th graders in final year of data (year 10), when college and career readiness is reported. Furthermore, these stakeholders identified a long-term goal of 70% of students achieving proficiency in reading/language arts and mathematics as representing ambitious, but attainable goals, because the increase in proficiency rates over time seemed appropriate.

Using subgroup performance data from the Mississippi Assessment Program administered to students during the 2015-16 school term, the MDE calculated baseline proficiency rates for the following racial/ethnic subgroups: Alaskan Native or Native American, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic/Latino, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races.

Additionally, baseline proficiency rates were calculated for the following subgroups: English Language Learners, Special Education, and Low-Income.

Once subgroup baseline rates were calculated, subgroup proficiency rates were reviewed to examine gaps between different student subgroups. The Black student subgroup consistently had a significantly lower proficiency rate than the All students group. Because the Black student subgroup is the largest subgroup of students in Mississippi, this group was selected as the target group for setting ambitious, but achievable goals that will result in achievement gap closure. Given that Mississippi has only administered its current state assessment for a single year, a linear growth model was used to project long term goals. Goals and interim measures are provided in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically disadvantaged students</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with disabilities</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English learners</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaskan Native or Native American</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Provide the measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for academic achievement in Appendix A.

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

As a long-term goal, Mississippi aims to eliminate the proficiency gap between Black students and All entirely, as the All students proficiency rate increases to 70% by 2025. For any subgroup with a baseline proficiency rate at or above 70% (as provided in Appendix A), it is expected that the subgroup maintain or exceed their baseline rate each year.

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

b. Graduation Rate. (*ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(bb)*)

1. Describe the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and for each subgroup of students, including: (1) the timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State, and (2) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

The leaders and stakeholders of Mississippi’s ESSA Advisory Committee used a similar 10-year time horizon and linear growth trajectory, finding it to be appropriately ambitious for schools and districts across the state.
Using subgroup four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate data from the cohort of students who graduated during the 2015-16 school term, the MDE calculated baseline graduation rates for the following racial/ethnic subgroups: Alaskan Native or Native American, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic/Latino, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races.

Additionally, baseline graduation rates were calculated for the following subgroups: English Language Learners, Special Education, and Low-Income.

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

As a long-term goal, Mississippi aims to close the graduation rate gap between Special Education students and All students. This gap will be reduced to 20%, as the All students graduation rate increases to 90% by 2025. This goal would more than double the current graduation rate for Special Education (from 34.7% to 70%) while also increasing the graduation rate for All students to a historic level of 90%. For any subgroup with a baseline proficiency rate at or above 90%, it is expected that the subgroup maintain or exceed their baseline rate each year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically disadvantaged students</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with disabilities</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English learners</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaskan Native or Native American</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

3. Provide the measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate in Appendix A.

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

As a long-term goal, Mississippi aims to close the graduation rate gap between Special Education students and All students. This gap will be reduced to 20%, as the All students graduation rate increases to 90% by 2025. This goal would more than double the current graduation rate for Special Education (from 34.7% to 70%) while also increasing the graduation rate for All students to a historic level of 90%. For any subgroup with a baseline proficiency rate at or above 90%, it is expected that the subgroup maintain or exceed their baseline rate each year.

c. **English Language Proficiency** *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii))*

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

The MDE leadership analyzed LAS Links scores and guidance
in understanding that English language proficiency is not acquired in a linear progression. Typical student progress toward proficiency is greater for students at lower levels of English language proficiency, and slows significantly as students get closer to English language proficiency. As a result, individual student annual targets depend on current LAS Links score.

When new standards and assessments are in place, the exit criteria for English learners may need to be adjusted. This adjustment will happen after the 2017-18 school term when the accountability system is revisited after three years of consistent implementation. Once cut scores are established, expected growth outcomes will be established that are consistent with other assessments that measure growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Baseline (Data and Year)</th>
<th>Long-term Goal (Data and Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English learners</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Mississippi is working to establish long-term and interim goals based on the LAS Links assessment; however, this assessment has only been given one year. Once expected measures of progress are established, interim measures of progress will be consistent with other indicators.

iv. Indicators (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B))
   a. Academic Achievement Indicator. Describe the Academic Achievement indicator, including a description of how the indicator (i) is based on the long-term goals; (ii) is measured by proficiency on the annual Statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments; (iii) annually measures academic achievement for all students and separately for each subgroup of students; and (iv) at the State’s discretion, for each public high school in the State, includes a measure of student growth, as measured by the annual Statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments.

During the 2015-16 school year, Mississippi implemented the new Mississippi Assessment Program (MAP) that is consistent with the rigor of the NAEP assessment and aligned with the skills and knowledge articulated in the Mississippi College and Career Readiness Standards. The assessments’ items/tasks (a) align to the targeted content standards, (b) extend across a range of cognitive demand; and, (c) use different formats to maximize a student’s ability to demonstrate his/her full understanding of the standards. Empirical evidence
suggests a unidimensional, latent construct is being measured and reported in the overall score. Further, the scores are highly stable with low measurement errors for both the overall population and for identified subgroups of students.

Academic achievement is measured by MAP for grades 3-8 in ELA and Mathematics, as well as end-of-course assessments in English II and Algebra I. In science, the Mississippi Science Test is given in grades 5 and 8, and Biology I is given at the high school level. U.S. History is also an end-of-course assessment given at the high school level.

Proficiency is calculated by dividing the total number of full academic year (FAY) students meeting proficiency on the reading/language arts, math, or science assessment by the total number of FAY students testing in that school/district. Proficiency is defined as achievement level four or five on five-level assessments (English and math assessments) and as three or four on four-level assessments (science and U.S. History assessments).

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

Subgroup performance is reported by the categories described in A.4.a of this document in order to identify performance gaps. In the accountability system, the growth of the lowest-performing 25% subgroup is included as a measure of student success in order to capture all at-risk students, regardless of subgroup characteristic.

Other academic indicators at the high school level include growth for all students and the lowest performing students in ELA and math from the 8th grade assessments to Algebra I and English II. A full description of growth is included in the response below, as growth is calculated consistently across grades and subjects.

The four-year graduation rate is included as another academic indicator for high schools. This indicator is weighted heavily at 200 points, and only students who meet the definition of a graduate in 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1) earn points for the school/district. It should be noted that since the implementation of the current accountability model, graduation rates have increased from 74.5 to 82.3.

b. **Indicator for Public Elementary and Secondary Schools that are Not High Schools (Other Academic Indicator).** Describe the Other Academic indicator, including how it annually measures the performance for all students and separately for each subgroup of
students. If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, the description must include a demonstration that the indicator is a valid and reliable statewide academic indicator that allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance.

Mississippi uses growth for its Other Academic Indicator. The Mississippi growth 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 Level 1 to Level 2 as for moving a student from Level 2 to Level 3. Likewise, if a student slides from Level 2 to Level 1, the school loses as much as a student sliding from Level 5 to Level 4. Academic growth is measured by the MAP for grades 3-8 ELA and Mathematics, and for English II and Algebra I in high school.

Growth is determined by whether or not a student increases in performance/proficiency levels from one (1) year to the next based on the following criteria:

An increase of ANY performance/proficiency level, staying at the same performance/proficiency that is at or above Proficient from one (1) year to the next, or an increase within the lowest three (3) performance/proficiency levels that crosses over the mid-point of the level.

Additional weight in the numerator is given for the following increases:
- Any increase of two (2) or more performance/proficiency levels will be given a weight = 1.2.
- Any increase to the highest performance/proficiency level will be given a weight = 1.25.

Assessments used for the calculation of growth include:
- Grade-level (3-8) assessments in English Language Arts;
- Grade-level (3-8) assessments in Mathematics;
- High School level assessments in English Language Arts;
- High School level assessments in Mathematics;
- Alternate Assessments (3-8 and High School) in English Language Arts; and
- Alternate Assessments (3-8 and High School) in Mathematics.

Currently, students taking Algebra I in 7th or 8th grade are required to also take the grade-level assessment in mathematics. Therefore, these students have two growth calculations: grade-level to grade-level and grade-level to Algebra I. The grade-level to grade-level growth calculations are applied to the current school. The grade-level to Algebra I growth calculations are banked until the student’s 10th grade year. Mississippi plans to exclude these advanced students from the 8th grade math assessment in the year the student takes Algebra I once the
more rigorous Algebra II assessment is in place at the high school level.

If a student does not have the previous year’s grade-level assessment, the student is excluded from the growth calculation(s) except in the cases of high school level assessments. For students taking high school level assessments in grades lower than 10th grade, growth is banked until the student’s 10th grade year and then applied.

For K-3 schools, growth of 4th grade students in the district is used for the growth calculations of the K-3 school in which they met FAY.

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

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

Mississippi uses the federal four-year, adjusted cohort to calculate the graduation rate indicator. No five-year extended graduation rate is calculated for use in the accountability system.

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

As a long-term goal, Mississippi aims to close the graduation rate gap between Special Education students and All students. This gap will be reduced to 20%, as the All students graduation rate increases to 90% by 2025. This goal would more than double the current graduation rate for Special Education (from 34.7% to 70%) while also increasing the graduation rate for All students to a historic level of 90%. For any
subgroup with a baseline proficiency rate at or above 90%, it is expected that the subgroup maintain or exceed their baseline rate each year.

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

d. Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP) Indicator.

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

For the purposes of exiting an English Language program, a student is considered proficient when the student earns the following scores on LAS Links: Overall 4-5, Reading 4-5, and Writing 4-5.

Because Mississippi has a very small EL population statewide (less than 2%) and very few schools meeting the minimum n-count of 10 (only 280 schools tested at least 10 students on the ELP assessment in 2015-16), Mississippi proposes to include the progress of EL students as a business rule as follows:

-Does the school have at least 10 English learners taking the English language acquisition exam?
-If no, do not make any changes to the school grade.
-If yes, did the school meet the English learner English language acquisition target?
-If yes, add a plus to the school grade
-If no, add a minus to the school grade

This method would allow for communication to the public about a school’s EL population and whether or not the school is meeting targets while not systematically affecting a school’s accountability measure simply because they do or don’t have an EL population.
Inclusion as a 100 point indicator in the state’s accountability model could later be implemented once valid and reliable measures of EL proficiency and growth are established, and as the EL population is more evenly distributed.

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

Mississippi uses the academic growth of the lowest performing students as its additional Student Success Indicator. This is a consistent measure across elementary, middle, and high schools in the State. Inclusion of this lowest quartile growth indicator forces schools to focus on at-risk students regardless of their demographic or curricular subgroup. Mississippi, as well as other states that have used this indicator, has shown gains in the NAEP results and positive movement in closing performance gaps.

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

At schools with a 12th grade (i.e. high schools), a College & Career Readiness (CCR) indicator is included. This indicator is calculated from performance on the ACT. The Mississippi legislature provides funding for all junior-year high school students to take the ACT assessment in a statewide administration. Seniors that have been enrolled in a Mississippi public school three full years, 10th through 12th grade, are used as the population for the CCR indicator. For this population, the percentage of students meeting English or reading ACT benchmarks is calculated and multiplied by 25. That result is added to the percentage of students meeting math ACT benchmarks multiplied...
by 25 for a total of 50 points in the accountability model. Scores from
ACT administrations other than the statewide administration that are
higher may be used in this calculation.

A second School Quality or Student Success Indicator is used in
schools with a 12th grade, an Acceleration indicator. The Acceleration
indicator refers to the percentage of students taking and passing the
assessment associated with the accelerated courses such as Advanced
Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), Advanced
International Certificate of Education (AICE), or SBE-approved
industry certification courses. For students taking dual credit and dual
enrollment courses, passing refers to students who are passing the
course with a “C” or above. For AP courses, the student must score at
least 3 on the AP exam. For IB courses, the student must score at least
4 on the IB exam. For AICE courses, the student must obtain a passing
score on the exam. (Passing scores of “A”, “B”, “C”, “D”, and “E” on
the AICE exams are not based on the American “A-F” grading scale.)
For industry certification courses, the student must pass the exam.
College courses must be credit-bearing courses with a minimum of
three (3) semester hours of credit and may be in any subject/content
area. The Acceleration component consists of a Participation and a
Performance component, which are combined for one (1) score worth
fifty (50) points.

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

The denominator for the Participation component calculation includes
all students not identified as Significant Cognitive Disabilities (SCD)
students whose Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS) grade
or peer-grade equivalent is 11th or 12th grade plus any 9th or 10th
grade students who are taking and passing these assessments/courses.
Students participating in multiple accelerated courses during the same
school year are given additional weighting in the numerator as follows:
2 courses: 1.1
3 courses: 1.2
4 courses: 1.3
5 courses: 1.4

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

The denominator for the Performance component calculation consists
of all students participating in the courses and/or tests identified in the
participation calculations.
Students who are enrolled in accelerated courses but do not take the required assessment will be considered as “not proficient” in the performance calculations.

v. **Annual Meaningful Differentiation (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C))**

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

**Elementary and Middle Schools (700 points possible):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proficiency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proficiency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proficiency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(100 pts.)</td>
<td>(100 pts.)</td>
<td>(100 pts.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth</strong></td>
<td><strong>Growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(100 pts.)</td>
<td>(100 pts.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth</strong></td>
<td><strong>Growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest 25%</td>
<td>Lowest 25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(100 pts.)</td>
<td>(100 pts.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Participation is measured in each subject**

Districts and Schools with 12th Grade (1000 points possible):
The Mississippi Accountability System has five performance levels using letter designations (i.e., A, B, C, D, & F). The associated cut scores differentiating each level of performance were established via a standard-setting process.

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

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

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

The following tables demonstrate the weighting of all indicators.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESSA Components</th>
<th>Elem School</th>
<th>Middle School</th>
<th>High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Achievement</strong></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43% of points</td>
<td>43% of points</td>
<td>40% of points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Another Academic Indicator</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29% of points</td>
<td>29% of points</td>
<td>30% of points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Language Proficiency</strong></td>
<td>+/- (specific future points TBD)</td>
<td>+/- (specific future points TBD)</td>
<td>+/- (specific future points TBD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Success</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29% of points</td>
<td>29% of points</td>
<td>30% of points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL POINTS</strong></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Percentage Weight of Each Component**

**Breaking out the Indicators by Components at the School Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Grade Component</th>
<th>Weight in Overall Elem School Grade</th>
<th>Weight in Overall Middle School Grade</th>
<th>Weight in Overall High School Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Achievement:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Proficiency</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Proficiency</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Proficiency</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies Proficiency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Another Academic Indicator:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Growth of All Students</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Growth of All Students</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-Year Graduation Rate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Success:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Growth of Lowest</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Growth of Lowest</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Success:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and Career Ready ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Success:</strong> College and Career Ready AP/IB/Dual/Industry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Language Proficiency:</strong> Proficiency and Progress</td>
<td>+/- (specific future points TBD)</td>
<td>+/- (specific future points TBD)</td>
<td>+/- (specific future points TBD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation Rate</strong></td>
<td>&lt;95% = lower grade by one letter</td>
<td>&lt;95% = lower grade by one letter</td>
<td>&lt;95% = lower grade by one letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL POINTS</strong></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**Example 1 (K-2 School):**
Reading/Language Arts and Math Proficiency - The reading/language arts and math scores from students in grade 3 who attended the K-2 school and are still in the same district will be used to calculate the math and reading/language arts proficiency for that K-2 school.

Science Proficiency - An equating process will be used to adjust the scores for this component.

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

**Example 2 (K-3 School):**
Reading/Language Arts and Math Proficiency - The reading/language arts and math scores from students in grade 3 at the school will be used to calculate the math and reading/language arts proficiency for that K-3 school.

Science Proficiency - An equating process will be used to adjust the
scores for this component.

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

All applicable FAY rules will apply.

**Example 3 (K-4 School):**
Reading/Language Arts and Math Proficiency - The reading/language arts and math scores from students in grades 3 and 4 at the school will be used to calculate the math and reading/language arts proficiency for that K-4 school.

Science Proficiency - An equating process will be used to adjust the scores for this component.

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

All applicable FAY rules will apply.

**Example 4 (6-7 School):**
Reading/Language Arts and Math Proficiency - The reading/language arts and math scores from students in grades 6 and 7 at the school will be used to calculate the math and reading/language arts proficiency for that 6-7 school.

Science Proficiency - An equating process will be used to adjust the scores for this component.

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

All applicable FAY rules will apply.

vi. **Identification of Schools (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D))**
a. **Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools.** Describe the State’s methodology for identifying not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement.
See the graphic below for a comprehensive overview of school identification and exit criteria, as well as timelines and supports for each category. In addition to the CSI and TSI identification of schools, the MDE also identifies districts under state law for two distinct categories. Within the school improvement continuum for student performance outlined in the graphic below, Mississippi law has established an Achievement School District (ASD), to be launched in the 2018-19 school year. The MDE will identify entire districts to become a part of the ASD.

Additionally, Mississippi law allows for a state control in districts where the governor has declared a state of emergency for reasons such as serious violations of accreditation standards, lack of financial resources, or issues with the safety or educational interests of children.
**District Identification Method:** in accordance with Mississippi Code, Annotated, 37-17-17, may include a school or district labeled as "F" for 2 consecutive years, or 2 out of 3 years.

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

**Supports:** includes TSI and CSI supports, if the school is so identified, as well as full governance of school by Department of Education.

**School Identification Method:**
- Bottom 5% of Title I A schools, or all "F" schools, whichever is greater; OR
- Graduation rate less than or equal to 67%; OR
- Previously identified Title I A Targeted Support and Improvement school with 3 consecutive years of subgroup performance at or below that of all students in the bottom 5% of schools.
- Schools will be categorized into Level 1 (the lowest performing 5% of schools or ~5 schools), Level 2 (the next lowest performing 10% of schools or ~11 schools), or Level 3 (the remaining 85% of identified schools or ~95 schools).
- **Exit:** above the bottom 5% of Title I A schools, or above all "F" schools, whichever is greater after 3 years; OR
- Graduation rate over 67% after 3 years; OR
- Subgroup performance above that of all students in the bottom 5% of schools for 3 consecutive years.
- **Timeline:** initial identification for 2018-19 based on 2017-18 data; subsequent identification every 3rd year.
- **Supports:** depending on Level, can include access to formula grants or competitive grants (split 50% / 50%) to invest in face-to-face coaching supports (literacy, school improvement, leadership), professional development access (literacy, leadership, blended learning concepts, other content areas), recommended list of evidence-based interventions.
- **Lea Role:** For Elementary / Middle Schools: LEAs need to complete a Capacity of Leadership assessment, create an Office of School Transformation to develop plan and monitor implementation, provide an annual progress report to the Executive Leadership team, attend required MDE trainings, and complete evidence-based application for (formula-based and?) competitive grants. For High Schools, LEAs will complete a Capacity of Leadership assessment, complete a restructuring plan for submission to the local school board, convene a Community Engagement Council, and attend relevant LEA-provided professional development.

**School Identification Method #1:**
- 3-year average growth in school subgroup proficiency is less than the target proficiency growth rate projected for the same statewide subgroup; AND
- School subgroup proficiency rate is less than statewide target proficiency rate for the same statewide subgroup in any of the 3 years being calculated.
- **Exit:** 3-year average growth in subgroup proficiency exceeds target proficiency growth rate projected for the same statewide subgroup.
- **Timeline:** initial identification for 2018-19 based on 2015-16, 2016-17, and 2017-18 data; subsequent annual identification based on most recent 3-year data trend.
- **Supports:** evidence-based interventions as outlined in TSI plan approved by local school board and implemented by the school district.

**Identification Method #2:** 3-year average subgroup performance is at or below that of all students in the lowest performing schools (bottom 5% of Title I A schools).
- **Exit:** subgroup performance above that of all students in the lowest performing schools (bottom 5% of Title I A schools), based on identification year data.
- **Timeline:** initial identification for 2018-19 based on 2017-18 data; subsequent identification every 3rd year.
- **Supports:** evidence-based interventions as outlined in TSI plan approved by local school board and implemented by the school district.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consistently Underperforming</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School will:</strong> Complete CNA to determine Root Cause (s) focus areas: Achievement, Fiscal and Human Resources, Instructional Capacity, Early Warning Mechanisms, MTSS Implementation effectiveness</td>
<td><strong>School will:</strong> Develop plan to address identified areas, must be board approved and aligned with Title I Schoolwide Plan – document plan and implementation progress in Indistar (MS SOARS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School will:</strong> Create a School leadership team to regularly address progress toward areas causing underperformance</td>
<td><strong>Funding Support (Formula and Competitive) used on Evidence-based interventions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School will:</strong> Set aside up to 10% of its Title I allocation to support evidence-based interventions for areas causing underperformance</td>
<td><strong>Provide Technical Assistance as requested/needed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School will:</strong> Present monthly progress update on plan implementation to District Leadership team (must be a standing item on the District Leadership Team Agenda)</td>
<td><strong>Provide PD that is focused on key areas for improvement/aligned to CNA areas</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School or District will:</strong> Establish and regularly engage P16 Community Engagement Council (Quarterly)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School will:</strong> Notify parents annually regarding identification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA/School Requirements</td>
<td>SEA Supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School will:</td>
<td>• Funding Support (Formula and Competitive) used on Evidence-based interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complete CNA to determine Root Cause (s) focus areas: Achievement, Fiscal and Human Resources, Instructional Capacity, Early Warning Mechanisms, MTSS Implementation effectiveness</td>
<td>• Provide Technical Assistance as requested/needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School will: Develop plan to address identified areas, must be board approved and aligned with Title I Schoolwide Plan – document plan and implementation progress in Indistar (MS SOARS)</td>
<td>• Provide PD that is focused on key areas for improvement/aligned to CNA areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>LEA will:</strong> Review and provide feedback on plan prior to submitting for board approval (Instructional and Fiscal Review)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School will: Create a school leadership team to regularly address progress toward areas causing underperformance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School will: Reserve 10% of its Title I allocation to support evidence-based interventions for areas causing underperformance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School will: Present monthly progress update on plan implementation to District Leadership team and local school board (must be a standing item on the District Leadership Team and School Board Agenda)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School or District will: Establish and regularly engage P16 Community Engagement Council (Quarterly)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District will: track progress of school quarterly to ensure fidelity to plan implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct End of year review summative review of school’s progress for the school year (may be revised once accountability results provided in the subsequent year)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Notify parents annually regarding identification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. **Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools.** Describe the State’s methodology for identifying all public high schools in the State failing to graduate one third or more of their students for comprehensive support and improvement.

See above graphic.

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

See above graphic.

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

See above graphic.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Identification Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistently Underperforming</td>
<td>The state will identify all schools using state-set long-term goals for each subgroup, examining the three-year growth in the percentage of students scoring proficient or above for each subgroup, as compared to the state projected proficiency targets. If a subgroup in a school does not average this amount of growth in proficiency rate over three years, the school will be identified as a targeted school for that subgroup. This percentage increase would vary by subgroup, but would remain constant over time for each group.</td>
<td>Initial Identification is 2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subsequent identification is an annual process, based on a 3-year data trend.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Identification Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-Performing</td>
<td>The state will identify schools with one or more low-performing subgroups if subgroup performance is at or below the performance of all students in the lowest performing schools (bottom 5% or all “F” schools)</td>
<td>Initial Identification 2018-19 Subsequent identification every 3 years (including identification year)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**g. Additional Statewide Categories of Schools.** If the State chooses, at its discretion, to include additional statewide categories of schools, describe those categories.

Not applicable.

**vii. Annual Measurement of Achievement (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(iii)):**
Describe how the State factors the requirement for 95 percent student participation in statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments into the statewide accountability system. If a school/district does not meet the 95% minimum participation rate, the school/district will automatically be dropped a letter grade on the accountability system. Although subgroup participation rates will be reported in addition to all students participation on State and LEA report cards, this penalty in school/district grades will apply to the overall, all students participation rate only. (A 94.5% participation rate will not be rounded to 95%.

**viii. Continued Support for School and LEA Improvement (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A))**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Uniform Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest Performing Schools</td>
<td>The state will exit all identified lowest performing schools if the school is no longer an “F” school or in the bottom 5% (whichever is more) of schools when the identification cycle runs every three years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low High School Graduation Rate</td>
<td>The state will exit all identified schools with Low High School Graduation Rate when the school has an average 3-year graduation rate above 67%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Low-Performing Schools</td>
<td>The state will exit schools identified as Chronically Low-Performing when the identified subgroup(s) are no longer performing in comparison with the “all” students subgroup in the lowest performing schools. The identification cycle will run one time every three years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. **Exit Criteria for Schools Receiving Additional Targeted Support.**
Describe the statewide exit criteria, established by the State, for schools receiving additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C), including the number of years over which schools are expected to meet such criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-Performing</td>
<td>The state will exit Title I A schools identified due to low-performing subgroups when one or more subgroups in question no longer demonstrates performance at or below the performance of all students in the lowest performing schools (bottom 5% or all “F” schools) when the identification process runs every three years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rigorous Interventions (Schools that fail to improve after prescribed number of years (3))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest Performing Schools</td>
<td>• District Team consisting of Superintendent, School Board President, Principal, classroom teacher and parent must participate in an interview with high level SEA team to address strengths, gaps, opportunities for growth, plan of action for improving student outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The SEA will take a more directive approach to activities. The LEA will amend plan to address the school’s staffing, budgeting, daily schedule as well as degree to which district will intervene with instructional decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The school must implement interventions that are more rigorous than previously implemented interventions included in CSI plan that must be of strong, moderate, or promising evidence.                           (Interventions must be, as practicable, be similar to schools demographics, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SEA may provide list of Evidence-based interventions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• School’s professional development plan must be approved by local school board and submitted for review by SEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• LEA must submit all contracts with external providers for review by SEA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• School may be considered for adoption into the Achievement School District – the SEA’s most rigorous intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• School must present to local school board monthly regarding progress toward plan (addressing relevant data - leading indicator and achievement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low High School Graduation Rate</td>
<td>• District Team consisting of Superintendent, School Board President, Principal, classroom teacher and parent must participate in an interview with high level SEA team to address strengths, gaps, opportunities for growth, plan of action for improving student outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• School must submit revised restructuring plan to SEA for approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• School must submit dropout prevention plan for review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• (Both plans will be addressed in the interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Downgrade accountability of high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• School must present to local school board monthly regarding progress toward plan (addressing relevant data - leading indicator and achievement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Low-Performing Schools</td>
<td>• Require principal to be replaced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- The school must implement interventions that are more rigorous than previously implemented interventions included in CSI plan that must be of moderate or strong evidence.
- (Interventions must be, as practicable, be similar to schools demographics, etc.)
- SEA may provide list of Evidence-based interventions)
- School must present to local school board monthly regarding progress toward plan (addressing relevant data - leading indicator and achievement)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periodic Resource Review</th>
<th>The SEA will:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provide guidance to school and district leaders regarding development of processes to address the inequities that exist as well as the expectation for addressing the inequities for improving student outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Periodically review inequities in resources (budget, personnel, materials, etc.) available in LEAs <strong>with a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement</strong> as compared to all other LEAs in the State, and in schools in those LEAs as compared to all other schools in the State.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Consider and, to the extent practicable, address any inequities- such as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Differences in rates at which low-income and minority students are taught by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers identified by the State and LEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Access to advanced coursework, including accelerated coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Access in elementary schools to full-day kindergarten programs and to preschool programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Access to specialized instructional support personnel including school counselors, school social workers, school psychologists, other qualified professional personnel, and school librarians;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Per-pupil expenditures of Federal, State, and local funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Access to any other resource provided by the LEA or school, such as instructional materials and technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Require the LEA to provide funding, to the extent practicable, to address any inequities found in TSI schools; to review PPA and direct use of funding by LEAs and provide state oversight if inequities are found in more than 50% of its schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Establish a protocol for periodic review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Year 1 – Self assessment by district (Require completion of SEA determined district readiness/capacity assessment tool by LEA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Year 2 – Technical Review with specified office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The periodic review will, to the extent practicable, be aligned with the identification year and during the year of identification an accreditation audit for instructional programs, safe and orderly schools, and fiscal services and will be conducted for LEAs with more than 50% of its schools with significant inequities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. **Technical Assistance.** Describe the technical assistance the State will provide to each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.
Face-to-face and virtual coaching supports, first access to certain professional development sessions, professional development coordinators, literacy coaches, school improvement coaches, leadership development?

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

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

5. Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators (ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B)): Describe how low-income and minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, and the measures the SEA agency will use to evaluate and publicly report the progress of the State educational agency with respect to such description.³ Click here to enter text.

6. School Conditions (ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(C)): Describe how the SEA agency will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A to improve school conditions for student learning, including through reducing: (i) incidences of bullying and harassment; (ii) the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom; and (iii) the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety.

Professional development for guidance counselors, administrators, and teachers will remain a focus, as the MDE works to implement Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports.

7. School Transitions (ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(D)): Describe how the State will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A in meeting the needs of students at all levels of schooling (particularly students in the middle grades and high school), including how the State will work with such LEAs to provide effective transitions of students to middle grades and high school to decrease the risk of students dropping out.

Transitioning from one level to the next can be difficult for some students and parents. In order to help alleviate anxiety and answer questions, school counselors collaborate with all stakeholders to ensure a smooth transition at each level. School counselors are

³ Consistent with ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B), this description should not be construed as requiring a State to develop or implement a teacher, principal or other school leader evaluation system.
encouraged to collaborate with other school counselors at upper and lower grade levels to design activities that support students in the transition from one school to the next. School counselors design programs which are inclusive and consider the needs of all students.

School counselors work with students to explore and plan for “next steps”, whether that is entering a new elementary school, middle school, high school or college. Transition from the middle school and high school is facilitated by the development of the Individual Success Plan (ISP). The ISP encompasses activities designed for students to explore their interests and abilities and to connect those interests and abilities to career pathways. School counselors work with students and parents to identify opportunities for advanced academic coursework, career and technical opportunities, and/or remedial needs.

High school counselors work with local, state, and national community college and universities to identify educational opportunities and supports for students. High school counselors provide information to parents and students regarding the college admissions, the application process, and completing scholarship and financial aid applications. Additionally, school counselors collaborate with their administration and local community and business leaders to determine opportunities in the local workforce. School counselors support the transition needs of all students including children with disabilities. School counselors are active members of the IEP team and assist with planning transition for children with disabilities.

Students who have a clear plan and can make the connection between school and life success are more engaged and get more out of the school experience. Also, when students are informed and have a clear sense of what is expected at each level, the transition from one school to the next is made much easier.

Additionally, the school counselor handbook is undergoing revisions. One of the components that will be added to the handbook is transitions. Guidance around “best practices” from the field will be made available to school counselors.

Mississippi also has developed a transition plan for Children with Disabilities. A transition plan is the section of the Individualized Education Program that outlines transition goals and services for the student. The transition plan is based on the individual needs and strengths of the student. The purpose of the plan is to identify and develop goals which need to be accomplished during the current school year in order to meet post-secondary goals. IDEA requires that a transition plan must be in place when the student turns 16. Mississippi State Board Policy 74.19 requires students in Mississippi to have a transition plan in place by age 14.
B. Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children

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

1. Supporting Needs of Migratory Children (ESEA section 1304(b)(1)): Describe how, in planning, implementing, and evaluating programs and projects assisted under Title I, Part C, the State and its local operating agencies will ensure that the unique educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, are identified and addressed through:
   i. The full range of services that are available for migratory children from appropriate local, State, and Federal educational programs;
   ii. Joint planning among local, State, and Federal educational programs serving migratory children, including language instruction educational programs under Title III, Part A;
   iii. The integration of services available under Title I, Part C with services provided by those other programs; and
   iv. Measurable program objectives and outcomes.

All children are determined to be migrant and eligible for services via the Migrant Education program before information is input into MIS2000. The information that is input into MIS2000 comes from Certificates of Eligibility (COE) that are completed on each migrant family.

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

The COE’s information is verified by trained recruiters. All COEs contain the signature of the interviewee, the interviewer/recruiter, the program coordinator (who verifies the content and eligibility of the family). If there is a question regarding eligibility, the COE is forwarded to the state for a final determination. All migrant recruiters are trained and certified by the SEA, ESCORT and national ID & R experts. Recruiters attend formal trainings, workshops and conferences at least three times per year they are required to maintain copies of ID & R guidelines/eligibility standards and the non-regulatory
guidance along with other relative educational/reference material. Recruiters are required to visit schools, attend parent meetings and community activities in order to identify and recruit migrant families, they also do home visits on a regular basis.

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

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

a. Canvassing the counties in which we have not previously had migrant students to determine if migrants have recently entered these areas. The MMESC will complete this task by visiting the areas, establishing new contacts, and conducting necessary research to establish a better mapping of the service area.

b. Implementing the Year-Long Recruiter Action Plan based upon the known areas of migrant concentration as well as the target areas for further exploration and identification of migrant students. This will ensure that recruiting, servicing, and networking are accomplished in each area that the MMESC is mandated to serve.

c. Providing staff development to all school districts by notifying them about the MMESC and its purpose. This presentation ensures that all school personnel have accurate information concerning the Migrant Education Program and the MMESC.

d. Planning and conducting sweeps during the harvest seasons of specific areas, with the recruiter of the region leading the recruitment plan. The ID&R Coordinator coordinates and facilitates the sweeps. The sweeps ensure that all areas in the specific region are covered with a team of recruiters recruiting in pairs for several days.

e. Building good relationships with farmers. The recruiters have built positive relationships with many farmers in their areas, resulting in the recruitment of many more migrant families. Recruiters visit every farm and farmer to be found in each area to introduce the program and to build a collaborative relationship.

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

a. The MMESC has participated in all Comprehensive Needs Assessment committee meetings, and in the development of the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and service delivery plan for the state of Mississippi.

b. The MMESC intends to continue moving toward implementation of the service delivery plan in order to better address and meet students’ needs.

c. The MMESC will continue to develop programs and increase collaborations with other agencies to better service the needs of these students.

d. The MMESC continues to participate as a member of the Needs Assessment Committee as follows:
  · Attends all Comprehensive Needs Trainings at the State level and Local level along with expert migrant consultants,
  · Continues to participate in the development and planning of the Comprehensive
Needs Assessment plan and service delivery for the state; and
  · Implements the Comprehensive Needs Assessment plan that the State develops to
declare the unique education needs of the migrant students and to better serve them.

Method to collect needed information: The local recruiter makes a visit to the potential
migrant family in which she collects information on the home needs. Additionally, the
recruiter/service provider collects information from the migrant students’ teacher and the
information is uploaded to the MIS2000 database. The projects coordinator creates an
educational service plan for the student. Educational services are delivered according to
the needs of the student.

2. **Promote Coordination of Services (ESEA section 1304(b)(3))**: Describe how the State
will use Title I, Part C funds received under this part to promote interstate and intrastate
coordination of services for migratory children, including how the State will provide for
educational continuity through the timely transfer of pertinent school records, including
information on health, when children move from one school to another, whether or not
such move occurs during the regular school year.

The MMESC staff has been granted read-only access to the state MSIS system, enabling
them to monitor the accuracy of MSIS data which can, in turn, be entered into the
MIS2000 database. With MSIS access, the MMESC can also ascertain which students are
ELL, and obtain migrant student test scores and other vital student information that will
provide educational continuity in a timely manner. This ability to utilize the information
in the state database and the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) leads to
more accurate Priority for Service (PFS) and ELL identification in the state and out of
state, as well as the transfer of pertinent school records, including relevant information
and moves occurring during the school year.

The MMESC plans to provide access to and train school counselors on how to use MSIX
so they may also access students’ records when needed. Additionally, the MMESC
promotes interstate and intrastate collaboration with health agencies willing to assist with
training and speaking to migrant parents on health issues.

3. **Use of Funds (ESEA section 1304(b)(4))**: Describe the State’s priorities for the use of
Title I, Part C funds, and how such priorities relate to the State’s assessment of needs for
services in the State.

The MMESC has developed and implemented an effective needs assessment process in
order to address the needs of migratory children and their families. The MMESC
continues to improve on the current needs assessment process in order to maximize
efficiency and productivity. The process occurs as follows:
* Immediately after a family is determined eligible for the MMESC, the recruiter
  conducts a needs assessment interview with the parents and child, completing a Student
  Record Report, which serves as a preliminary assessment of what services or referrals
  need to be provided.
* MSIX is utilized to find out if any prior records or needs assessments are available for a
  new migrant student.
* Once needs are established, the Recruiter will determine the actions that must be
  implemented by the MMESC, service agencies, or the school in order for that child to
  achieve academic performance targets and for his/her overall well-being.
* Needs assessments are conducted annually at the beginning of the school year and more often for at-risk PFS students.
* An individualized service plan will be designed for each student following the service delivery plan in efforts to ensure academic success. Services will be provided accordingly via after school program, summer program, individual tutoring, or referral to other programs in existence.
C. Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk

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

a. Transitions Between Correctional Facilities and Local Programs (ESEA section 1414(a)(1)(B)): Provide a plan for assisting in the transition of children and youth between correctional facilities and locally operated programs.

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

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

b. Program Objectives and Outcomes (ESEA section 1414(a)(2)(A)): Describe the program objectives and outcomes established by the State that will be used to assess the effectiveness of the Title I, Part D program in improving the academic, career, and technical skills of children in the program.

Objectives
- Provide technical support for the staff at the state’s correctional facilities, focusing on strategies that serve

Outcomes
- Students who are enrolled in the program long-term (90 days or more) will show at least a 5 percent increase in reading proficiency between pre-tests and post-tests.
- Students who are enrolled in the program long-term (90 days or more) will show at least a 5 percent increase in math proficiency between pre-tests and post-tests.
- All students served by the program will leave the program with up-to-date reading and math achievement records.
- Neglected and Delinquent facilities served by Title I, Part D funds will see a 5 percent increase in the percentage of students receiving a high school diploma or receiving a high school equivalency.
D. Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction

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

Use of Funds (ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(A) and (D)): Describe how the State educational agency will use Title II, Part A funds received under Title II, Part A for State-level activities described in section 2101(c), including how the activities are expected to improve student achievement.

Goal 4 of the Mississippi Board of Education 5-Year Strategic Plan 2016-2020 states that “every school has effective teachers and leaders.” This goal involves ensuring that teachers and leaders are provided with opportunities for continuous professional growth at every stage of their career continuum. This continuum includes the attraction and recruitment of teachers/leaders, the strengthening of teacher and leader preparation programs, improving the state’s licensure/certification process, ensuring that all districts provide an evidenced-based induction and mentoring program for novice teachers and leaders, and refining the continuous cycle of professional growth.

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

The MDE will collaborate with the Educators Rising and Teacher Academy programs to provide guidance and assistance to student interested in teaching. This effort will support the Grow-Your-Own initiative. Educators Rising identifies its mission is to “cultivate highly skilled educators by guiding young people on a path to becoming accomplished teachers, beginning in high school and extending through college and into the profession.” By virtue of joining Educators Rising, students are expressing an interest in exploring a career in education.

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

Induction and Mentoring
A review of the literature on teacher attrition reveals a lack of support as a major cause for teachers leaving the profession. In Mississippi, nearly 50 percent of teachers leave the profession within the first five years. In addition, many educator preparation programs are not providing teachers candidates with the skills to be effective in the classroom. Increasingly, induction and mentoring programs help to provide teachers with strategies to improve their effectiveness. Currently, there is no policy or law requiring induction and mentor programs for novice teachers. Future refinements to the licensure process is seeking to change this. See section 3.
Goal 4: Every school has effective teachers and leaders

- Induction and Mentorship
- Educator Equity
- Professional Growth System
- Teacher Leadership
Professional Growth System
In recent years, the MDE has transitioned through several revisions of an educator evaluation system, resulting most recently in the development and adoption of the Mississippi Professional Growth System (PGS), which was implemented for the first time during the 2016-17 school term. The MDE plans to offer school and district leaders ongoing training in the understanding and implementation of the PGS (rubric requirements, educator observation processes, and coaching conversations). While data from the educator evaluation system has not been extensively used at the state level in the past, the state has begun developing professional development sessions aligned to the expectations of the PGS. The MDE will be reviewing statewide trend data during the summer of 2017 and providing training sessions aligned to strategic areas that need to be addressed through professional development for teachers, thereby allowing principals to better align teacher professional development with specific needs based on prior evaluation results.

The educator evaluation systems in Mississippi are intended to identify strengths and areas for growth in educators’ practice to provide feedback for improvement. To accomplish this broad goal requires the MDE to continuously review and refine the Mississippi educator evaluation systems to ensure that they are providing valuable information about educator practice. Well-designed and implemented evaluation systems provide critical information to the MDE and school districts to inform decisionmaking and improve teaching.

In the fall of 2015, the MDE assembled a group of diverse stakeholders to review and recommend refinements to the educator evaluation systems as a part of the Educator and Leader Effectiveness Steering Committee. Steering committee members were recruited through the MDE’s monthly Research and Development newsletter and educator associations (Mississippi Association of Educators, Mississippi Professional Educators, and Jackson Federation of Teachers). Approximately 430 stakeholders expressed interest in serving on the Steering Committee. A priority in establishing this committee was to seek input from a diverse group of educators from the entire state. To accomplish this, the committee was assembled with great deliberation to ensure there was diversity in congressional district, grade level, subject area, years of experience, gender, and race. The committee was divided into Tiers 1 and 2. Tier 1 was made up of 52 participants who participated in a series of five face-to-face monthly meetings from November 2015 – March 2016. Stakeholders who were not selected to participate in Tier 1 were given the opportunity to provide input electronically as Tier 2 members; 163 stakeholders agreed to serve on Tier 2.

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

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

TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEM COMPONENTS

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

Classroom Observations Using the PGS
Classroom observations using the PGS was implemented during the 2016-17 school year. In a study of the Cincinnati Public Schools’ Teacher Evaluation System (TES) using observation records between the 2000-01 and 2008-09 school years, Kane, Taylor, Tyler, & Wooten (2011) concluded that the teachers’ classroom practices, as measured by TES scores (based on the Danielson Framework for Teaching), predicted differences in student achievement. The study revealed that teachers with higher observation ratings also yielded higher student outcomes. The results of this study suggest a relationship between teachers’ observation results and student achievement (Kane, Taylor, Tyler, & Wooten, 2011).

Student Outcomes
Student Outcome measures will be implemented during the 2018-19 school year. Research has suggested that teacher value-added models can accurately predict a teachers’ impact on student outcomes. Researchers used a random-assignment experiment in Los Angeles Unified School District to evaluate various non-experimental methods for estimating teacher effects on student test scores. Having estimated teacher effects during a pre-experimental period, researchers used these estimates to predict student achievement following random assignment of teachers to classrooms. The researchers’ analysis suggested that standard teacher value-added models are able to generate unbiased and reasonably accurate predictions of the causal short-term impact of a teacher on student test scores (Kane & Staiger, 2008).

ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION SYSTEM COMPONENTS

School Site Observations & 360-degree feedback tool (i.e., the Circle Survey)
School site observations were implemented in the 2016-17 school year. A 360-degree feedback tool will be implemented during the 2018-19 school year. Clifford & Ross (2012a) identified multiple measures that should be included in a principal evaluation system. These measures include professional qualities and practices, professional growth and learning, school culture and climate, stakeholder satisfaction, and student educational outcomes. The researchers also emphasized the importance of using multiple measures when evaluating principals (Clifford and Ross, 2012b). “Due to the complexity of a principal’s job, principals want and need substantive feedback that is comprehensive, accurate, valid, and useful. Areas of performance must be identified using comprehensive data gathered from multiple sources” (Clifford & Ross, 2012b, p. 37).
Student Outcomes
Student outcomes will be implemented in the 2018-19 school year. New Leaders for New Schools conducted a comprehensive literature review on evaluating principals. The organization identified four strategies for improving principal evaluation systems: (1) make student outcomes and teacher effectiveness outcomes 70% of a principal’s evaluation and the remaining 30% on leadership actions shown to drive better results; (2) base the evaluation of principal managers and other central office staff primarily on student outcomes and principal effectiveness; (3) develop performance expectations that are universally high and differentiated in ways that drive continuous improvement; and (4) ensure that the evaluation system is informed by principals and other experts.

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

Professional Development Menu of Services
In addition to the development of sessions based on PGS outcomes, the MDE presently offers a menu of services, describing professional development available on demand to all educators in Mississippi’s public schools. These sessions are designed to improve educator effectiveness and meet the needs of our state’s diverse student population. The skills that are addressed in these current and future trainings will increase the achievement of all students.

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

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

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

The MDE is planning to use the 3% set-aside under Sec. 2101(e)(3) to strengthen leadership development opportunities. The MDE will use the funds to provide school
leaders with evidenced-based training and support on providing teachers with high-quality feedback and instruction coaching. The MDE is focused on improving the capacity of existing school and district administrators and in developing the next generation of leaders to guide schools toward better outcomes for students. Through a revision of the Orientation for School Leaders processes and the development of expanded ongoing professional development offerings for school administrators, the MDE will carry out this effort in support of the MBE Strategic Plan.

Use of Funds to Improve Equitable Access to Teachers in Title I, Part A Schools (ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(E)): If an SEA plans to use Title II, Part A funds to improve equitable access to effective teachers, consistent with ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B), describe how such funds will be used for this purpose.

TEACHER WORKFORCE

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

During the 2016-2017 school year, approximately 73 percent of Mississippi teachers were white, while 56 percent of public school students were of color. Male teachers accounted for approximately 20 percent of the teacher workforce, but only 6 percent of those were from minority ethnic groups. Given the emergence of recent research on the benefits of a diverse teacher workforce, these disparities between the student and teacher populations reveal an opportunity for the MDE to implement strategies to diversify the teacher pipeline.

In a recent study, Gerthersan, Hart, Lindsay, & Papageorgen (2017) found that having just one black teacher in third, fourth or fifth grade reduced low-income black boys' probability of dropping out of high school by 39 percent. The study also found that these students were more likely to take college entrance exams. In their report, Gerthersan, et al. (2017) writes that the findings suggest that “a straightforward policy lever- assignment of black male students to black teachers – can help to close frustratingly persistent achievement gaps” (page 36). The impact of minority teachers on the achievement of minority students is evident in other studies. Goldhaber and Hansen (2009) found evidence that black teachers have more consistent success than their white counterparts in teaching black students. The researchers also found that black teachers scoring on the lower end on the Praxis exam distribution had even greater success with black students (Goldhaber and Hansen, 2009).

In its review of existing research, Alfred Shanker Institute (2014) suggests that minority teachers not have a positive impact on minority students, but all students benefit from a diverse teacher workforce. In addition to reducing stereotypes and unconscious implicit biases, having teachers from diverse backgrounds also helps to prepare students to live in an increasingly diverse society (Alfred Shanker Institute, 2014).

Because of what research reveals, the goal of Mississippi’s DTP action plan is to increase the percentage of minority teachers in the work force and to provide them with the support needed to improve effectiveness, and thus, increase retention. In addition, it is also important that all teachers in the state become culturally responsive in their practice. In order to ensure equitable access of effective teachers for
minority students and those from low-income households, the MDE must implement a set of strategies
designed to attract, prepare, support, and retain minority teachers.

Critical Shortage School Districts

The Mississippi Critical Teacher Shortage Act of 1998 was established with the purpose of attracting
qualified teachers critical shortage school districts in the state. These districts have large minority student
populations and high teacher attrition rates. As a result, many of these districts are also rated “D” or “F”
in the state’s accountability system which used to measure student achievement. The State Board of
Education designates these districts using a formula that was created to identify districts with the greatest
teacher recruitment and retention challenges. The current formula is currently being refined to more
accurately identify districts.

ATTRACTIONg MINORITY TEACHERS

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

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

Because current high school students are a significant pool of future teachers, a strategy in attracting and
recruiting future minority teachers, particularly those in communities with large minority student
populations, is to encourage, foster and support students who have expressed interest in teaching.

Teacher Academies and Educators Rising

To MDE currently coordinates Teacher Academy programs and Educators Rising chapters (formerly
known as Future Educators Association) to identify students interested in education. Teacher Academy is
a pathway for students in the Education and Training career cluster in Career and Technical Education
(CTE). The Teacher Academy program is a high school program with courses designed to attract students
to the field of education, to provide information and field experiences relevant to pursuing a degree in
education, and to prepare students for the rigors of a career in education so they will remain long-term
educators. The Teacher Academy pathway includes classroom and hands-on experiences that will prepare
students for employment or continuing education in the education field. Educators Rising is an
organization that provides prospective teachers the experience and skills they need to be ready for the
classroom. Starting with high school students, Educators Rising provides passionate young people with
hands-on teaching experience, sustains their interest in the profession, and helps them cultivate the skills
they need to be successful educators. The result is a pipeline of well-prepared teachers who are positioned
to make a lasting difference — not only in the lives of their students, but also in the field of teaching more
broadly. The Mississippi Department of Education will:

- Partner with critical shortage geographical districts to assist with the establishment of an
  Educators Rising chapter
- Provide support to the school districts which have an Educators Rising chapter and/or Teacher
  Academy program
• Attend regional meeting hosted by the local Educators Rising chapters to disseminate information regarding scholarships and other teaching incentives
• Maintain ongoing communication with Teacher Academy and Educators Rising members to track their progress from their chapters to teacher preparation programs to the classroom. Build relationships with the members and help to guide them into the classroom.
• Promote the teacher education programs within the Teacher Academies and Educators Rising chapters to encourage members to major in education
• Promote Institutions of Higher Learning (IHL) incentives for Teacher Academy completers majoring in education
• Encourage community colleges’ departments of education and IHL educator preparation programs to Adopt-An-Educators Rising chapter in their surrounding school districts or partner with districts to establish a chapter.

Initial success of this strategy would be all critical shortage school districts having active Teacher Academies and/or Educators Rising chapters. Long term success would be Teacher Academies and/or Educators Rising chapters in 75% of the states’ high schools. South Carolinas High School Teacher Cadet Program has served as early introduction of the profession to minority students. Eventually, the program was expanded to approximately 73 percent of the state’s high schools. An analysis of the program revealed that one in five participants has gone on to earn teacher certification. Mississippi will establish a target of 25 percent of Teacher Academy and Educators Rising students will earn certification BY 2025. Currently, students in the program are not tracked after graduating. This strategy will be managed by the Office of Educator Accountability.

**Grow Your Own Programs**

The MDE will provide guidance and technical assistance to districts to support the development and implementation of Grow-Your-Own programs. These programs create a teacher workforce pipeline for students, paraprofessionals, and other community members. Grow-Your-Own programs also help to create a sustainable pipeline of educators who are members of the community in which they teach, particularly in urban and isolated rural districts. Grow Your Own programs would represent an innovative partnership of educator preparation programs, school districts, and community organizations that supports P-12 students, parents, community members, emergency substitutes, and paraprofessionals in low-income communities to become certified. With statistics revealing that many teachers have a strong preference to teach close to home, Grow-Your-Own programs attacks the systemic nature of teacher shortages by guiding people from these communities to become teachers. The Grow Your Own strategy works to address the dual goals of alleviating the teacher shortage crisis while improving workforce diversity to better reflect the P-12 student population.

The MDE will host **Pathways to Licensure Workshops**. These workshops are the first step in providing districts with support in establishing Grow-Your-Own programs. The workshops are designed for paraprofessionals who want to learn about options to certification. The MDE will use the content of this workshop series to develop a structured Grow-Your-Own program for districts.

Mississippi’s Grow-Your-Own initiative is being designed 1) to create a pipeline of highly effective teachers and 2) improve teacher retention in the districts with high teacher attrition. It will be a partnership of teacher/community organizations, institutions of higher education, school districts, and the MDE that support parents, community members, and non-licensed school district personnel to become effective teachers. The MDE’s goal is to provide guidance, strategies, and support for school districts to establish and maintain a local Grow-Your-Own program. The MDE will:
• Using Title II funds, convene a Task Force to develop a Grow Your Own program structure that school districts, educator preparation, and community organizations can use
• Facilitate the partnership between the Grow Your Own programs and educator preparation programs
• Maintain ongoing communication with Grow-Your-Own participants to track their progress from teacher preparation programs to the classroom.
• Build relationships with the participants and help guide them into the classroom. The MDE will serve as a resource for the participants.
• Partner with teacher and/or parent organizations to recruit their non-licensed members
• Partner with school districts to recruit non-licensed community members

Success would be all critical shortage school districts actively recruiting teachers from the community, parents, paraprofessionals, and classified employees. These Grow Your Own programs should be partnered with an educator preparation program.

**Community College Partnerships**

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

Innovative programs like the 2 Plus 2 Program that Hinds Community College and Delta State University is an example of a partnership between community colleges and educator preparation programs. Hinds Community College signed a 2 plus 2 agreement with Delta State University to offer junior and senior level courses for a bachelor's degree in Elementary Education and the Childhood Development Program. Jackson, MS area students who wish to complete their Elementary Education degree can take classes at a designated Hinds campus, by way of traditional classroom, video conferencing and online.

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

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

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

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

Participants of such partnerships benefit from having streamline matriculation alternatives and an aligned community college and IHL educator curriculum. The MDE will encourage the partnerships, and success would be a similar partnership at all community colleges with education programs. In addition, the MDE will actively recruit on the campus of the community colleges, informing students of critical shortage incentives.

**SUPPORTING**

Nationally, minority teachers are being hired at higher proportion than their white counterparts, but the diversity problems lies in attrition. Minority teachers are leaving the profession at a higher rate than other teachers. Nationally, attrition is, in fact, negating gains made by recruitment efforts. For instance, in the 2003-2004 school year, 47,000 new minority teachers entered the workforce, but in the 2004-2005 school year, 56,000 chose to leave the profession.

Minority teachers are disproportionately employed in predominantly urban, predominantly poor, and predominantly high minority schools. Because of the perceived challenges of teaching in these schools, minority teachers are quitting at higher rates. All new teachers need support and development throughout their careers, but new teachers are particularly in need of support. To combat high attrition requires that the support and development of these teachers are strengthened.

**Tiered License**

The MDE is partnering with the CEEDAR Center to revise the current licensure structure and recommend to the licensure commission a tiered licensure system for teachers and leaders reflecting ongoing training and professional development to support all students (SBE Goal 4).

This system should have an induction level license for new teachers. To convert the license to a standard five-year license will require districts to provide structured induction and mentoring programs with trained mentors and targeted professional development based on the Mississippi Educator and Administrator Professional Growth System (PGS).

Success would be the full implementation of the tiered license system with the MDE providing ongoing support and training to districts on induction and mentoring, and how to use the PGS to give teachers high-quality feedback to inform professional development decisions.

**Induction and Mentoring**

A review of the literature on teacher attrition reveals a lack of support as a major cause for teachers leaving the profession. In Mississippi, nearly 50 percent of teachers leave the profession within the first five years. In addition, many educator preparation programs are not providing teachers candidates with the skills to be effective in the classroom. Increasingly, induction and mentoring programs help to provide teachers with strategies to improve their effectiveness. Currently, there is no policy or law requiring induction and mentor programs for novice teachers. Induction and mentoring programs have been shown to increase new teacher retention by nearly 6 percent and 7 percent, respectively.
2. Using Title II funds, the MDE will provide technical assistance and training to districts on implementing structured induction and mentoring programs. Currently, the MDE provides mentor training materials, but offer no regional training to district leaders on the implementation of the training. The partnership with CEEDAR should result in a mandated induction and mentoring programs for all districts with the MDE providing training to districts virtually and face-to-face.

3. **System of Certification and Licensing (ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(B))**: Describe the State’s system of certification and licensing of teachers, principals, or other school leaders.

   All Mississippi educators must meet licensure guideline requirements as certified teacher and administrators and to be highly qualified. The [Guidelines for Licensure K-12](#) is a handbook of all licensure requirements approved by the Mississippi State Board of Education for all types of teacher and administrator licensure and certification required by law. All guideline changes require action by the State Board of Education.

4. **Improving Skills of Educators (ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(J))**: Describe how the SEA will improve the skills of teachers, principals, or other school leaders in order to enable them to identify students with specific learning needs, particularly children with disabilities, English learners, students who are gifted and talented, and students with low literacy levels, and provide instruction based on the needs of such students.

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

**LETTRS Training**

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

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

Principals also had the opportunity to attend the *Principal’s Primer for Raising Reading Achievement*, the complement to LETTRS professional development. This training
provides a “how-to” manual for principals who want to improve the school’s overall reading performance. It explains in very practical terms exactly how a principal can lead a school to implement research-based, multi-tier reading instruction and achieve optimal results, especially with students from economically, socially, or educationally disadvantaged backgrounds. *A Principal’s Primer for Raising Reading Achievement* gives a series of specific steps for principals to follow which include: providing focus specifically on the role of the principal in teaching literacy; giving the nuts and bolts of what to do with whom, how to get the work done, and how to monitor the school’s progress toward shared goals; identifying specific resources and materials of value within a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS); and, learning from the expertise of leaders who earned national and state recognition for outstanding school improvement.

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

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

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

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

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

The MDE has utilized the grant funds to strategically enhance the efforts of the OIS to support districts, teachers, schools, as well as community organizations.

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

The MDE utilizes the MTSS process and developed Early Warning System (EWS) Guidance document to assist districts and schools with addressing behavioral issues. When providing onsite technical assistance, we request that participating school teams bring readily available district and school data so that we can utilize and discuss the key indicators such as attendance, course performance (for both teachers and students), behavior, school climate, over representation of groups within the school, students with or without disabilities, gender, and race specific data. From this data, we then determine what additional supports and guidance are needed for individual schools and districts to support the identification of students at risk of missing key educational milestones. The MDE guides districts with evaluating the data to identify the ability to recognize factors that are negatively impacting student learning and behavior as well as, provide supports and interventions to help get students back on track in school, and ultimately, to graduate. In addition, the MDE has a State Personnel Development grant with REACH MS to provide extensive targeted MTSS-behavior training and ongoing technical assistance for PBIS. They specifically provide guidance in conjunction with the MDE on selecting, administering, and using local school and district behavioral data as well as surveying to make decisions pertaining to the Tier process.

**ELs**

The MDE has hired 2 individuals who have a strong background in working with English learners. Since the beginning of 2016, the MDE has expanded regional trainings for teachers working with English learners and has offered ongoing technical assistance to districts with an English learner population. Training for teachers and paraprofessionals has focused on instructional practices for building academic vocabulary, as well as information on language acquisition. Additionally, a series of cultural proficiency trainings are scheduled for the summer. Differentiated technical support has been provided to federal programs directors and English Learner directors and coordinators, with a targeted focus on equipping leaders to evaluate their programs and practices. The
MDE is moving toward the adoption of English Language Proficiency standards, and staff will begin conducting professional development on the newly adopted standards during the 2017-18 school year.

**Gifted**

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

5. **Data and Consultation (ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(K)):** Describe how the State will use data and ongoing consultation as described in ESEA section 2102(d)(3) to continually update and improve the activities supported under Title II, Part A.

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

6. **Teacher Preparation (ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(M)):** Describe the actions the State may take to improve preparation programs and strengthen support for teachers, principals, or other school leaders based on the needs of the State, as identified by the SEA.

The MDE is currently revisiting the format for reviewing and approving educator preparation programs (EPPs) in the state. The goal of this revision is to align the state approval process more closely to the national accreditation by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). This alignment will eliminate duplication of effort and reporting, and will ensure all state EPPs are evaluated by more rigorous standards.

Additionally, the MDE is examining how to best connect student outcomes with EPPs, in order to demonstrate effectiveness of EPPs in producing teachers who can, in turn, produce learning gains for students.


E. Title III, Part A, Subpart 1: English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement

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

1. Entrance and Exit Procedures (ESEA section 3113(b)(2)): Describe how the SEA will establish and implement, with timely and meaningful consultation with LEAs representing the geographic diversity of the State, standardized, statewide entrance and exit procedures, including an assurance that all students who may be English learners are assessed for such status within 30 days of enrollment in a school in the State.

Title III in Mississippi services close to 12,000 students from many different countries and speaking many different languages. The MDE works closely with school districts to ensure the needs of all English learners are being met. Teachers are trained in an ongoing manner on how to provide accommodations to ensure the success of all English Learners. While not all Mississippi school districts participate in Title III funding, all school districts are held to the same academic standards for English learners. The state of Mississippi uses the LAS Links Assessment System to assess English language proficiency of English learners.

**Progression of a Student through the EL Program**

1. Enrollment in school and administration of *Home Language Survey (HLS)*
2. Identified as potential English learner (EL) through HLS
3. Takes the LAS Links (Placement Test) to determine English language proficiency (ELP) level and need for ESL services
4. Placement in an English Learner (EL) program of services
5. Annual assessment of English language proficiency using LAS Links. Students are required to achieve an overall proficiency level of 4 or higher, a writing proficiency level of 4 or higher, and a reading proficiency level of 4 or higher on the English Language Proficiency Test to transition out of EL program.
6. Monitor student’s ability to participate meaningfully in mainstream classroom for 4 years.

2. **SEA Support for English Learner Progress (ESEA section 3113(b)(6))**: Describe how the SEA will assist eligible entities in meeting:
   i. The State-designed long-term goals established under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii), including measurements of interim progress towards meeting such goals, based on the State’s English language proficiency assessments under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(G); and
   ii. The challenging State academic standards.

   The MDE leadership analyzed LAS Links scores and guidance in understanding that English language proficiency is not acquired in a linear progression. Typical student progress toward proficiency is greater for students at lower levels of English language proficiency, and slows significantly as students get closer to English language proficiency. As a result, individual student annual targets depend on current LAS Links score.

   **When new standards and assessments are in place, the exit criteria may need to be adjusted.** LAS Links assessment results from spring 2017 will not likely be
back in time to run calculations, and to provide a strategic second data point to determine precise cut scores. This adjustment will likely happen after the 2017-18 school term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Baseline (Data and Year)</th>
<th>Long-term Goal (Data and Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English learners</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Monitoring and Technical Assistance (ESEA section 3113(b)(8))**: Describe:
   
   i. How the SEA will monitor the progress of each eligible entity receiving a Title III, Part A subgrant in helping English learners achieve English proficiency; and
   
   ii. The steps the SEA will take to further assist eligible entities if the strategies funded under Title III, Part A are not effective, such as providing technical assistance and modifying such strategies.

The SEA monitors the Title III program, ensuring that funds are used to advance the language acquisition of English Learners. Monitoring includes an analysis of the use of funds and whether all fund uses are allowable. After the monitoring process, if a district’s Title III program is found to be ineffective, the district receives additional technical support from the MDE’s Office of Federal Programs. Title III staff are available to discuss EL program best practices. Additionally, a Professional Development Coordinator is available to provide additional coaching and training to EL teachers, regular classroom teachers and tutors.
F. Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants

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

1. Use of Funds (ESEA section 4103(c)(2)(A)): Describe how the SEA will use funds received under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 for State-level activities.

Mississippi has dozens of programs spanning birth through college and career to help ensure students have the skills they need to be successful and that the adults in the building are well supported. The following is an overview of the emerging education ecosystem designed to provide an equitable education to all Mississippi students.

Early Childhood to Elementary School

Early Learning Collaborative
Mississippi’s state-funded Early Learning Collaborative program has provided local communities with the opportunity to fund high-quality four-year-old pre-kindergarten programs in communities across the state. In addition to the Early Learning Collaboratives, a number of districts are supporting early childhood programs funded through a blended approach, including local funds, federal funds, and partnerships with Head Start.

Elementary School to Middle School

Third Grade Reading Summative Assessment
Through legislation passed in 2013, Mississippi has placed a strong emphasis on students reading at grade level by the end of third grade. Through a broadly deployed series of professional development and through the support of literacy coaches placed in the schools that struggle most with third grade reading proficiency, the MDE has strengthened the capacity of teachers across the state. Through a technical amendment passed in 2016, students will be required to score above the two lowest levels on the state accountability assessment for third grade reading beginning in the 2018-19 school term, an increase from the current requirement that students score above the lowest achievement level for promotion.

Middle School to High School

Career & Technical Education Student Technology Coordinators
Need description here.

High School to Post-Secondary Education

ICAP Graduation Plans
Need content here

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

National Defense Cadet Corps (NDCC) is another option for schools to consider in states where additional JROTC programs cannot be added. NDCCs are the same as JROTCs – same course, same uniforms, same activities, etc. – with one exception: funding. NDCCs are almost entirely funded by the local school district whereas, JROTCs are heavily subsidized by the military service that they represent.

**Multiple Pathways to Earning Diplomas**
- AP
- Dual Enrollment
- ACT stipend
- SREB Courses
Need description here.

**System-Wide Approach**

**Arts Integration**
Mississippi’s Whole School Initiative is a comprehensive statewide arts education program that uses arts as a vehicle for promoting high-quality instruction and learning for students in all disciplines. This unique program goes far beyond “art for art’s sake” and applies the learning power of the arts across the entire curriculum. The Whole Schools Initiative provides statewide support to teachers on integrating the arts to provide learning opportunities to improve students’ academic achievement through the integration of the arts into the core curriculum. Arts discipline to increase students’ and teachers’ skill, knowledge, awareness, and experiences in all arts disciplines.

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

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

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

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

**Counselors**
Need content here

**Early Warning System**
The MDE developed the Early Warning System (EWS) as a guide to assist school districts and schools in their efforts to help students succeed academically and emerge from Mississippi high schools well prepared for college and careers. As research indicates, a student’s decision to drop out of school is a gradual process that starts well before high school. Therefore, it is important to identify at-risk students and provide supports that lead to increasingly successful engagement in school as early as possible.

**Equitable Access to Resources**
School libraries support rigorous personalized learning experiences supported by technology and ensure equitable access to resources for all students. AND Need description here.

**Family Guides for Student Success in Spanish**
Parents are their child’s first teachers in life and know their child better than anyone else. Parents have valuable insights into their child’s needs, strengths, abilities, and interests.

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

**Foster Care Guidance**
Need description here.

**Juvenile Detention Center Collaborations with Special Education & General Education**
Need description here.

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

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

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

**State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG)**
Need description here.

**Summer Feeding Programs**
Need description here.

**Well-Rounded Educational Opportunities**
Central to Mississippi’s instructional approach is to ensure that every student in every school has access to educational opportunities that are well-rounded. These efforts from MDE to LEAs include improving access to world languages, arts education (including dance, media arts, music, theatre, visual arts), supporting college and career counseling, including providing information on opportunities for financial aid through the early FAFSA, providing programming to engage all students in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM), including computer science, promoting access to accelerated learning opportunities including Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) programs, dual or concurrent enrollment programs and early college high schools, and strengthening instruction in American history, civics, economics, geography, government, and environment education.

**Teacher Recruiting, Retention, and Development**

**Early Childhood Grant**
Through a grant from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the MDE will be expanded support for early
childhood educators across the state. The grant will support teachers statewide in a variety of pre-K settings to implement developmentally appropriate practices in their classrooms. Major grant activities include professional development and coaching support, pre-K program evaluation to ensure program quality and student progress, the implementation of developmental assessments for students, and assistance with increasing parents’ participation in their children’s education.

**IHL Collaboration**
Need content here

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

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

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

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

**On-Demand Professional Development**
Need description here.

2. **Awarding Subgrants** (*ESEA section 4103(c)(2)(B)*): Describe how the SEA will ensure that awards made to LEAs under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 are in amounts that are consistent with ESEA section 4105(a)(2).
G. Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers

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

1. **Use of Funds** (*ESEA section 4203(a)(2)*): Describe how the SEA will use funds received under the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program, including funds reserved for state-level activities.

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

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

2. **Awarding Subgrants** (*ESEA section 4203(a)(4)*): Describe the procedures and criteria the SEA will use for reviewing applications and awarding 21st Century Community Learning Centers funds to eligible entities on a competitive basis, which shall include procedures and criteria that take into consideration the likelihood that a proposed community learning center will help participating students meet the challenging State academic standards and any local academic standards.

   Click here to enter text.
H. Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program

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

1. Outcomes and Objectives (ESEA section 5223(b)(1)): Provide information on program objectives and outcomes for activities under Title V, Part B, Subpart 2, including how the SEA will use funds to help all students meet the challenging State academic standards.

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

1. Describe in detail the need for the project, the goals and objectives relating to increased student academic achievement, decreased student dropout rates, or other factors the LEA may choose to measure;

2. Provide a summary of both the comprehensive needs assessment and the academic achievement on state assessments;

3. List the ESEA goal(s) and indicator(s) the LEA will implement and describe the activities that the LEA will use to meet the goal(s) and indicator(s). The MDE will measure the program’s effectiveness based on the LEA’s ability to meet the identified goals and objectives per the identified timeline. The MDE will provide program guidance through all available means to support LEAs to ensure RLIS funds are used as intended and are aligned with prioritized needs and goals of eligible LEAs.

2. Technical Assistance (ESEA section 5223(b)(3)): Describe how the SEA will provide technical assistance to eligible LEAs to help such agencies implement the activities described in ESEA section 5222.

Click here to enter text.
I. Education for Homeless Children and Youth program, McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Title VII, Subtitle B

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

1. **Student Identification** (*722(g)(1)(B) of the McKinney-Vento Act*): Describe the procedures the SEA will use to identify homeless children and youth in the State and to assess their needs.

   The MDE will identify and assess homeless children and youth in the state and will assist LEAs in the following:

   - Provide training and technical assistance on identification of homeless children and youths and unaccompanied youths
   - Disseminate posters and other resources to promote awareness (such as welcome packets and NCHE’s Homeless Education Liaison Toolkit)
   - Update and maintain a state webpage accessible for families and youth experiencing homelessness (post parent guides and other resources to inform homeless families of their educational rights)
   - Host a homeless conference to provide an opportunity for collaboration between the state agency, LEAs, and agencies that service the homeless population (Federal Programs State Conference)
   - Ensure local liaisons are designated for each district and properly trained on the McKinney-Vento Act
   - Develop training modules for districts to use for local training of school personnel on the identification and support of homeless children and youth
   - Share data and guidance on state website and update annually
   - Establish an advisory council comprised of multiagency personnel who work with homeless children and youth, such as school district homeless liaisons, public and private child welfare and social service providers, law enforcement, juvenile and family courts, mental health providers, child care providers, educators, etc. from across the state that will assist in the development and revisions of policies, procedures, and resources; facilitate local and interagency collaboration
   - Host quarterly conference calls or webinars for networking and collaboration among district-level homeless liaisons
   - Monitor LEA plans to meet the needs of homeless children and youth.

2. **Dispute Resolution** (*722(g)(1)(C) of the McKinney-Vento Act*): Describe procedures for the prompt resolution of disputes regarding the educational placement of homeless children and youth.

   The MDE Office of Federal Programs has adopted a complaint resolution process. The dispute process includes a LEA component that addresses the concerns of the parents or constituent at the local level; a state level that addresses the concerns if the dispute is not resolved by the LEA’s board of education. This process ensures a prompt resolution of the documented dispute and addresses the concerns of all parties.

3. **Support for School Personnel** (*722(g)(1)(D) of the McKinney-Vento Act*): Describe programs for school personnel (including the LEA liaisons for homeless children and youth, principals and other school leaders, attendance officers, teachers, enrollment
personnel, and specialized instructional support personnel) to heighten the awareness of such school personnel of the specific needs of homeless children and youth, including runaway and homeless children and youth.

The MDE will provide assistance for school personnel via the following programs:
- Facilitate training sessions on homeless education during statewide educational events to provide guidance on best practices, allowable costs, and blending and braiding of funds (such as superintendents’ meetings, conferences hosted by other MDE offices, Boots on the Ground, etc.)
- Provide training resources (online training modules, toolkits, posters, etc.) and post on the state website to assist with local training of district personnel, such as, educators, cafeteria workers, and bus drivers
- Provide technical assistance to LEAs on the local implementation of the McKinney-Vento Act, spending, and other requested topics for assistance
- Encourage districts to develop local advisory councils for collaboration on their specific, local needs and resources

4. Access to Services (722(g)(1)(F) of the McKinney-Vento Act): Describe procedures that ensure that:
   i. Homeless children have access to public preschool programs, administered by the SEA or LEA, as provided to other children in the State;
   ii. Homeless youth and youth separated from public schools are identified and accorded equal access to appropriate secondary education and support services, including by identifying and removing barriers that prevent youth described in this clause from receiving appropriate credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending a prior school, in accordance with State, local, and school policies; and
   iii. Homeless children and youth who meet the relevant eligibility criteria do not face barriers to accessing academic and extracurricular activities, including magnet school, summer school, career and technical education, advanced placement, online learning, and charter school programs, if such programs are available at the State and local levels.

The MDE will ensure the following support to LEAs:
- Encourage LEAs to use enrollment and withdrawal forms to inquire about living situations and siblings of school-aged children or ensure they develop procedures within each LEA
- Support intra-agency collaboration and training of MDE office staff to ensure identification of homeless children and youth for early identification and support
- Encourage districts to use funds to establish Pre-K programs
- Encourage collaboration between the SEA, LEAs, and Head Start programs
- Encourage the consistent prioritization of homeless children and youth during the enrollment process and participation in extracurricular activities and extracurricular and nutrition programs
- Ensure LEAs develop procedures to award credit to homeless youths who satisfactorily completed full or partial coursework at a prior school, as part of the immediate enrollment process and to transmit that information to future schools
- Ensure LEAs develop alternate application procedures which will allow homeless students the opportunity to immediately enroll in magnet and charter schools, AP courses, CTE, etc.
5. **Strategies to Address Other Problems (722(g)(1)(H) of the McKinney-Vento Act):** Provide strategies to address other problems with respect to the education of homeless children and youth, including problems resulting from enrollment delays that are caused by—
   i. requirements of immunization and other required health records;
   ii. residency requirements;
   iii. lack of birth certificates, school records, or other documentation;
   iv. guardianship issues; or
   v. uniform or dress code requirements.

   District homeless liaisons and other school and district staff, including school counselors, social workers and mental health providers, receive technical assistance outlining the rights of students who are homeless to enroll immediately, including in the case of unaccompanied minors or students with guardianship challenges. Staff are trained and equipped to work within existing social service systems to help students resolve guardianship issues and to ensure that students have the appropriate support.

6. **Policies to Remove Barriers (722(g)(1)(I) of the McKinney-Vento Act):** Demonstrate that the SEA and LEAs in the State have developed, and shall review and revise, policies to remove barriers to the identification of homeless children and youth, and the enrollment and retention of homeless children and youth in schools in the State, including barriers to enrollment and retention due to outstanding fees or fines, or absences.

   Both state and local policies must be reviewed and revised to reflect changes to the McKinney-Vento Act under ESSA. Districts have been provided with a webinar outlining changes to policy, and are required to update their district policies accordingly. Homeless students and families must be provided a written statement of their rights when they enroll and at least two times per year. Districts also are required to have a dispute resolution process, and the state also has a process for students and families who are unable to resolve disputes at the local level.

7. **Assistance from Counselors (722(g)(1)(K)):** A description of how youths described in section 725(2) will receive assistance from counselors to advise such youths, and prepare and improve the readiness of such youths for college. Counselors and district homeless liaisons will receive technical assistance outlining how to remove barriers homeless students often face when attempting to enroll in college, including supports for how to fill out FAFSA as unaccompanied minors. Additionally, schools and districts will be required to analyze the academic achievement data of students who are homeless, and to provide intervention services to homeless students.
Appendix A: Measurements of interim progress

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

A. Academic Achievement

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically disadvantaged students</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with disabilities</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English learners</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaskan Native or Native American</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically disadvantaged students</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with disabilities</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English learners</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaskan Native or Native American</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3rd Grade Baseline and Long-term Goals for Student Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>Reading/ Language Arts</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically disadvantaged students</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with disabilities</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English learners</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaskan Native or Native American</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4th Grade Baseline and Long-term Goals for Student Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>Reading/ Language Arts</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically disadvantaged students</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with disabilities</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English learners</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaskan Native or Native American</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5th Grade Baseline and Long-term Goals for Student Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>Reading/ Language Arts</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically disadvantaged students</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with disabilities</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English learners</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaskan Native or Native American</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6th Grade Baseline and Long-term Goals for Student Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>Reading/ Language Arts</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically disadvantaged students</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with disabilities</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English learners</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaskan Native or Native American</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7th Grade Baseline and Long-term Goals for Student Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>Reading/ Language Arts</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically disadvantaged students</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with disabilities</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English learners</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaskan Native or Native American</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8th Grade Baseline and Long-term Goals for Student Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>Reading/ Language Arts</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically disadvantaged students</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with disabilities</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English learners</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaskan Native or Native American</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For any subgroup with a baseline proficiency rate at or above 70%, it is expected that the subgroup maintain or exceed their baseline rate each year.
**High School Baseline and Long-term Goals for Student Proficiency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>Reading/ Language Arts</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically disadvantaged students</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with disabilities</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English learners</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaskan Native or Native American</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**B. Graduation Rates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically disadvantaged students</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with disabilities</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English learners</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaskan Native or Native American</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Baseline (Data and Year)</th>
<th>Long-term Goal (Data and Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English learners</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

NOTICE TO ALL APPLICANTS

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

To Whom Does This Provision Apply?

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

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

What Does This Provision Require?

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

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

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

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

(1) An applicant that proposes to carry out an adult literacy project serving, among others, adults with limited English proficiency, might describe in its application how it intends to distribute a brochure about the proposed project to such potential participants in their native language.

(2) An applicant that proposes to develop instructional materials for classroom use might describe how it will make the materials available on audio tape or in braille for students who are blind.

(3) An applicant that proposes to carry out a model science program for secondary students and is concerned that girls may be less likely than boys to enroll in the course, might indicate how it intends to conduct "outreach" efforts to girls, to encourage their enrollment.

(4) An applicant that proposes a project to increase school safety might describe the special efforts it will take to address concern of lesbian,
gay, bisexual, and transgender students, and efforts to reach out to and involve the families of LGBT students.

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

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