OFFICE OF CHIEF ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICER
Summary of State Board of Education Agenda Items
February 20, 2025

OFFICE OF DISTRICT AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

01. Action: Approval of the amendment to Mississippi's ESSA Consolidated State Plan [Goals 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 – MBE Strategic Plan]

Background Information: The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 1965 reauthorized as the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015 outlines requirements for administration and implementation of the consolidated state plan. Before a state may implement changes to its approved accountability system, the state must submit a proposed amendment to the US Department of Education and receive approval of the amendment. The Commission on School Accreditation met in a special called meeting on February 11, 2025, and voted 8 to 1 in favor of approving this amendment.

This item references Goal 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the *Mississippi Board of Education Strategic Plan*.

Recommendation: Approval

Back-up material attached

FEBRUARY 2025

Mississippi
Consolidated State Plan
The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act

U.S. Department of Education
Issued: March 2017

Submitted: September 17, 2019 Amended February 2025

OMB Number: XX
Expiration Date:

COVER PAGE

Contact Information and Signatures	
SEA Contact (Name and Position) Sonja J. Robertson, Ph.D. Executive Director of School Improvement	**Telephone:** 601.359.1003
Mailing Address: P. O. Box 771 Jackson, MS 39205-0771	**Email Address:** srobertson@mdek12.org
By signing this document, I assure that: To the best of my knowledge and belief, all information and data included in this plan are true and correct. The SEA will submit a comprehensive set of assurances at a date and time established by the Secretary, including the assurances in ESEA section 8304. Consistent with ESEA section 8302(b)(3), the SEA will meet the requirements of ESEA sections 1117 and 8501 regarding the participation of private school children and teachers.	
Authorized SEA Representative (Printed Name) Lance Evans, Ed.D. State Superintendent of Education	**Telephone:** 601.359.3512
Signature of Authorized SEA Representative	**Date:**
Governor (Printed Name) Honorable Tate Reeves	**Date SEA provided plan to the Governor under ESEA section 8540: August 1, 2017**
Signature of Governor	**Date:**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

(Originally Submitted: September 17, 2019)

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 for the jobs of the future and to be successful in careers that will lead our state forward. Innovation and economic development in Mississippi are 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

MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Ensuring a bright future for every child

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)

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)[1]

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?

☒ **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.

☐ **Yes** ☒ No

[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.

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.

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. (Mississippi Code 3-3-31 (2013) states "The English language is the official language of the State of Mississippi.") According to the chart below which includes the five most represented languages other than English, Mississippi has yet to reach 3% of students speaking any language other than English. Mississippi is defining languages "present to a significant extent" as the most populous language other than English (currently Spanish), as well as any language for which 5% or more of students in tested grades speak the language.

Languages Other Than English			
LANGUAGE SPOKEN	NUMBER OF ENGLISH LEARNERS THAT SPEAK LANGUAGE	NUMBER OF ENGLISH LEARNERS IN TESTED GRADES THAT SPEAK LANGUAGE	PERCENTAGE OF MISSISSIPPI STUDENTS THAT SPEAK LANGUAGE
Spanish	8,243	4,813	1.69%
Arabic	480	286	0.09%
Vietnamese	277	176	0.05%
Chinese	223	118	0.04%
Gujarati	85	49	0.02%

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.

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.

There are no languages for which assessments are not available and are needed, based on 3(i).

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.

As described in 3(i), there are no languages other than English present to a significant extent. 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
- Students with disabilities
- English learners (ELs)
- Alaskan Native or Native American

- Asian
- 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 National Assessment of Educational Progress (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.

NOTE: Recently arrived English learners have been enrolled in a school in one of the 50 States in the United States or the District of Columbia for less than 12 months.

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 Mississippi's accountability system measures is 10.

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

By taking a population perspective in its accountability system, Mississippi does not use statistical sampling in accountability data, rather the full population is used. Given the large number of small schools within Mississippi, 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 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) model, 74% of the schools in Mississippi were not held accountable for the students with disabilities (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 95% is suppressed for subgroup data. Larger aggregates, such as graduation rate and participation rate at the school or district level are suppressed at less

[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.

than 5%.

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 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. This long-term goal will more than double proficiency rates for all students and most subgroups over the time period in both reading/language arts and mathematics.

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 Learners,
- Students with Disabilities, and
- Low-Income.

A linear growth model was used to project long-term goals and interim measures. Goals and interim measures are provided in Appendix A.

READING/LANGUAGE ARTS PROFICIENCY		
	BASELINE DATA	LONG-TERM GOAL
SUBGROUPS	2015-16	2026-27
All students	32.6%	70.0%
Economically disadvantaged students	24.4%	70.0%
Students with disabilities	8.9%	70.0%
English learners	13.6%	70.0%
Alaskan Native or Native American	28.0%	70.0%
Asian	57.7%	70.0%
Black or African American	18.9%	70.0%
Hispanic/Latino	28.4%	70.0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	48.9%	70.0%
White	47.5%	70.0%
Two or More Races	37.3%	70.0%

MATHEMATICS PROFICIENCY		
	BASELINE DATA	LONG-TERM GOAL
SUBGROUPS	2015-16	2026-27
All students	31.1%	70.0%
Economically disadvantaged students	23.1%	70.0%
Students with disabilities	9.1%	70.0%
English learners	22.9%	70.0%

MATHEMATICS PROFICIENCY		
SUBGROUPS	BASELINE DATA 2015-16	LONG-TERM GOAL 2026-27
Alaskan Native or Native American	26.2%	70.0%
Asian	68.3%	70.0%
Black or African American	17.4%	70.0%
Hispanic/Latino	32.9%	70.0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	48.1%	70.0%
White	45.2%	70.0%
Two or More Races	36.2%	70.0%

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.

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 comparison group for setting ambitious but achievable goals that will result in achievement gap closure. As a long-term goal, Mississippi aims to eliminate the proficiency gap between Black students and All students entirely, as the All students proficiency rate increases to 70% by 2027.

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 Learners,
- Students with Disabilities, and
- Low-Income.

GRADUATION RATE		
SUBGROUPS	BASELINE DATA 2015-16	LONG-TERM GOAL 2026-27
All students	82.3%	90.0%
Economically disadvantaged students	78.8%	88.5%
Students with disabilities	34.7%	70.0%
English learners	55.9%	78.9%
Alaskan Native or Native American	87.5%	92.2%
Asian	92.6%	94.3%
Black or African American	78.9%	88.6%
Hispanic/Latino	81.8%	89.8%

GRADUATION RATE		
	BASELINE DATA	LONG-TERM GOAL
SUBGROUPS	2015-16	2026-27
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	77.8%	88.1%
White	85.8%	91.5%
Two or More Races	78.2%	88.3%

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.

   Once subgroup baseline rates were calculated, subgroup graduation rates were reviewed to examine gaps between different student subgroups. The students with disabilities 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 comparison group for graduation gap closure calculations.

   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 2027. 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 will 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 is transitioning its English language proficiency assessment from LAS Links to the English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century (ELPA21). ELAPA21 will be administered for the first time in spring 2025.

The exit criteria for English learners is a determination of Proficient, characterized by a performance level of 4 or 5 in each domain.

MDE will establish long-term goals and develop targets for progress to proficiency for ELPA21 following the operational administration in spring 2025. Since the prior English language proficiency assessment in 2024 is LAS Links, MDE will create a statistical correspondence between ELPA21 and Las Links to facilitate transitional progress to proficiency calculations for school year 2024-2025. School year 2025-26 represents the first time that two years of ELPA21 data are available, at which time MDE will review and refine procedures as necessary to establish a stable baseline.

The MDE will establish targets to define adequate progress to proficiency in six years or less, depending on their starting level.

The MDE will conduct research following the spring 2025 administration to select the appropriate progress targets working closely with experts in English language proficiency and the states Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

~~The MDE leadership analyzed LAS Links scores and guidance in understanding that English language proficiency is not acquired in a linear progression.~~

~~When new ELP standards are in place and assessments have been determined to be aligned, 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.~~

~~For the calculation of progress toward English language proficiency, students are assigned an annual target score based on their initial year composite score on the ELP assessment and the corresponding score required to meet overall proficiency in five years or less. Students will be awarded points (between 0 and 1) in direct proportion to the progress made toward this annual target.~~

~~Step 1: Calculate annual target score.~~

~~Step 2: Calculate points earned for each student.~~

Once the new targets are established, MDE anticipates incorporating the results into accountability in the same manner as the existing system. A student meeting or exceeding the progress target would earn a score of 1. Partial points may be provided proportionately based on progress that fails to reach the annual target (e.g., students who make half of the expected gains would earn a score of .5). A student who regresses or earns the same score as the prior year would earn a score of 0.

~~A student meeting or exceeding progress would earn a score of 1, while a student making half of the expected progress would earn a score of 0.5. A student who regresses or earns the same score as the prior year will earn a score of 0.~~

Within a school, the average score is calculated for all EL students. This average score is multiplied by a maximum of 35 points in the

accountability model for schools without 12th grade, or a maximum of 50 points in the accountability for schools that include 12th grade. ~~This resulting score is adjusted such that a school average student rate of 0.9 or higher shall receive the maximum points for this indicator. This adjustment is applied uniformly to all other averages, effectively increasing each value by 10 percent.~~

The EL indicator will carry a weight of 5% of the overall accountability model, which is appropriate for Mississippi schools, as less than 3% of Mississippi students are classified as ELs statewide.

~~It is anticipated that within 10 years, 70% of ELs will make adequate growth within the time period identified as appropriate based on their initial ELP level. Goals and interim measures are provided in Appendix A.~~

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.~~

This information will be provided following the 2025 administration.

~~2.~~

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.

Mississippi's academic achievement indicator is based on proficiency scores as measured by the Mississippi Academic Assessment Program (MAAP) for grades 3-8 in reading/language arts and mathematics and by secondary end-of course assessments in English II and Algebra I or an approved Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Assessment as described in Miss. Admin. Code 7-3: 78.11, State Board Policy Chapter 78, Rule 78.11 Guidelines for Mississippi's Implementation of the Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized, High School Assessment. The new

MAAP 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.

Proficiency is calculated by dividing the total number of full academic year (FAY) students (overall or by subgroup) meeting proficiency on the reading/language arts or math assessment by the total number of FAY students testing in that school/district. Proficiency is defined as achievement level four or five on the five-level reading/language arts and math assessments. In the event that a school or district tests less than 95% of FAY students (or 95% of each subgroup) in reading or math, the denominator is increased to 95% of FAY students in the calculation of proficiency. The denominator will be the greater of 95% or all FAY students.

Scores of students taking Algebra I or English II 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).

These reading/language arts and math tests annually measure proficiency for all students and subgroups. Performance for all students in included in the accountability model. Subgroup performance is reported by the categories described in A.4.a of this document in order to identify performance gaps and will be used to identify Targeted Support and Improvement schools.

In high schools, Mississippi uses growth for all students and growth among the lowest quartile as another academic achievement indicator for all public-school students. Assessments used for the calculation of growth in high schools include end-of-course assessments in reading/language arts (English II) and mathematics (Algebra I) or an approved Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Assessment as described in Miss. Admin. Code 7-3: 78.11, State Board Policy Chapter 78, Rule 78.11 Guidelines for Mississippi's Implementation of the Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized, High School Assessment.

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.

A full description of growth is included in the response below, as growth is calculated consistently across grades and subjects.

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 has one Other Academic Indicator. Growth is measured in reading/language arts and mathematics growth for all students with additional weight being placed on students performing in the lowest quartile.

GROWTH

The current Mississippi growth model incentivizes schools to move all students to the next level of reading/language arts or math proficiency regardless of their current level and penalizes schools that allow a student's proficiency level to drop. This indicator is measured annually. In the Mississippi model, the school gets as much credit for moving a student from Performance Level 1 (Minimal) to Performance Level 2 (Basic) as for moving a student from Performance Level 2 to Performance Level 3 (Pass). Likewise, if a student slides from Performance Level 2 to Performance Level 1, the school loses as much as a student sliding from Performance Level 5 (Advanced) to Performance Level 4 (Proficient). Academic growth is measured by the MAAP for grades 3-8 reading/language arts and mathematics.

Growth is determined by whether or not a student increases in performance/proficiency levels from one 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 year to the next, or

- An increase within the lowest three 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 or more performance/proficiency levels will be given a weight = 1.25.
- Any increase to the highest performance/proficiency level will be given a weight = 1.25.
- Maintaining the highest performance/proficiency level from one year to the next will be given a weight = 1.25.
- Total growth scores may not exceed the 95 or 100 points assigned to a growth indicator.

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.

Assessments currently used for the calculation of growth include:

- Grade-level (3-8) assessments in English Language Arts;
- Grade-level (3-8) assessments in Mathematics;
- Alternate Assessments (3-8) in English Language Arts; and
- Alternate Assessments (3-8) in Mathematics.

If a student does not have the previous year's grade-level assessment, the student is excluded from the growth calculation(s).

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. Explanations of growth calculations for schools with other non-tested grade configurations may be found in A.4.v.c.

Mississippi also measures the reading/language arts and math growth of the lowest-performing students as a part of growth calculations, placing additional weight on this group of students. This is a consistent measure across elementary, middle, and high schools (as described in Academic Achievement) in the State. Additional weight on this lowest quartile growth 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 ELA and the Lowest-Performing Students subgroup in mathematics are determined using the

same method as growth for all students. 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-Performing subgroup. Using the lowest quartile ensures the inclusion of the maximum number of students in the accountability model.

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).

The federal four-year, adjusted cohort 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. No five-year or other extended graduation rate is calculated for use in the accountability system. This indicator annually measures graduation rates for all students. Mississippi's long-term goals for graduation for all students and subgroups are based on this measure as well. Since the implementation of the current accountability model, graduation rates have increased from 74.5 to 82.3 for the all students group.

Once subgroup baseline graduation rates were calculated, subgroup graduation rates were reviewed to examine gaps between different student subgroups. The students with disabilities 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.

Mississippi will 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. 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.

English Language Proficiency is defined as an overall ~~score of 4-5.~~determination of Proficiency on ELPA21.

For the calculation of progress toward English language proficiency, students are assigned an annual target level~~score~~ based on their initial year of ELP assessment and the corresponding level~~score~~ required to reach overall proficiency on the ELP assessment in six~~five~~ years or less.

The EL indicator will carry a weight of 5% of the overall accountability model, which is appropriate for Mississippi schools, as less than 3% of Mississippi students are classified as ELs statewide.

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.

SCIENCE AND SOCIAL STUDIES PROFICIENCY

Science proficiency is measured by the Mississippi Academic Assessment Program (MAAP) in grades 5 and 8 and by the Biology I end-of-course exam in high school or an approved Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Assessment as described in Miss. Admin. Code 7-3: 78.11, State Board Policy Chapter 78, Rule 78.11 Guidelines for Mississippi's Implementation of the Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized, High School Assessment~~. Social studies proficiency in high school is measured by the U.S. History end-of-course exam or an approved Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Assessment as described in Miss. Admin. Code 7-3: 78.11, State Board Policy Chapter 78, Rule 78.11 Guidelines for Mississippi's Implementation of the Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized, High School Assessment~~, which is currently limited to the Cambridge IGSCE assessment consistent with our approval for reading/language arts, mathematics, and science assessments outlined from the U.S. Department of Education in November 2022. As with reading/language arts and math proficiency, science ~~and social studies~~ proficiency is calculated by dividing the total number of FAY students meeting proficiency on the science ~~or social studies~~ assessment by the total number of FAY students testing in that school/district. ~~Proficiency is currently defined as achievement level three or four on the four-level science and social studies assessments. As these assessments move to a five-level system of performance, proficiency will be defined as level four or five.~~

Scores of students taking the Biology I assessment in a grade below 10th grade will be "banked" for proficiency/achievement 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). All science ~~and social studies~~ tests annually measure proficiency for all students and subgroups. Performance for all students is included in the accountability model.

At schools with a 12th grade (i.e. high schools), ~~two~~ one additional Student Success indicator~~s are~~ is used: a College & Career Readiness (CCR) indicator~~. and an Acceleration indicator.~~

The CCR indicator includes three components: Acceleration, Achievement, and Assessment. Together, these components are intended to incentivize and monitor a broad range of valued accomplishments associated with the preparation for and attainment of readiness in college, career, and/or the military. The below table details the CCR indicator:

Acceleration	Participation Calculation 25 Points Maximum			Performance Calculation 25 Points Maximum		50 Maximum
	The numerator for the Participation component calculation will be the number of students taking accelerated courses and/or related exams. The denominator for the Participation component calculation shall include all students in 11th or 12th grade plus any 9th or 10th grade students who take and pass accelerated assessments and associated courses where applicable. (No additional fractional weighting)			The numerator for the Performance component calculation will be the number of students taking and passing accelerated assessments/courses such as AP, IB, AICE, dual credit, dual enrollment, or industry certification courses. The denominator for the Performance component calculation will consist of all students participating in the courses and/or tests identified in the participation calculations.		
Achievement	**0/1**	**.25/1**	**.5/1**	**.75/1**	**1/1**	**50 Maximum**
	Does not graduate or earn GED by end of 5th year of 9th grade cohort	Approved diploma equivalency by 5th year or 5th year graduate	Traditional Graduate	Diploma with Academic or Career/ Technical or JROTC Endorsement	Diploma with Distinguished Academic Endorsement or Career/ Technical endorsement or JROTC Endorsement with equivalent distinguished measures	
Assessment	**0/1**	**.25/1**	**.5/1**	**.75/1**	**1/1**	**50 Maximum**
	Does not attain qualifying assessment score	ACT 15 Superscore or 850 SAT	ACT 17 Superscore or 930 SAT	ACT 20 Superscore or 1040 SAT	ACT ≥ 25 Superscore or 1210 SAT	
		ACT WorkKeys Bronze or ASVAB/AFQT 31	ACT WorkKeys Silver or ASVAB/ AFQT 50	ACT WorkKeys Gold or ASVAB/ AFQT 65	ACT WorkKeys Platinum or ASVAB/ AFQT 93	

The Acceleration component~~indicator~~ refers to the percentage of students taking and passing the assessment associated with accelerated courses such as Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), Advanced International Certificate of Education (AICE), or MBE-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 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 score. Specific details of the calculation are provided below. Within the component, 23.75 points are earned from Participation, and 23.75 points are earned from Performance, with a maximum combined score of 47.5 or 50 points. Based on data from 2016-17, points earned on this indicator ranged from 0.5 points to 37.6 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 whose Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS) grade is 11th or 12th grade plus any 9th or 10th grade students who are taking and passing these assessments/courses.

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. 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 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.

The Achievement component incentivizes the attainment of a diploma supported by a broad range of accomplishments central to post-secondary success in college, career, and/or the military, reflected in Mississippi's diploma endorsements. A full point is awarded for a distinguished diploma endorsement, followed by a standard endorsement (.75 points), a traditional diploma (.5 points), and a diploma equivalency (.25 points). No points are awarded when a student fails to earn a graduation credential in 5 years. Including these accomplishments in the school accountability model will better incentivize and reward the attainment of a range of valued accomplishments. Importantly, this component is supplemental to the 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, which maintains a prominent influence in the school accountability model.

The Assessment component encourages and rewards increasing levels of performance on nationally recognized assessments associated with post-secondary success: ACT, SAT, ACT WorkKeys, and ASVAB/AFQT. The

performance expectations reflected in the preceding table were selected to reward performance associated with meaningful opportunities for post-secondary success.

~~The CCR indicator is calculated from performance on the ACT or ACT WorkKeys Certification.~~ The Mississippi Legislature provides funding for all junior-year high school students to take the ACT assessment in a statewide administration. LEAs are also able to report and include higher scores than those earned on the statewide administration in this calculation. ~~Seniors that have been enrolled in a Mississippi public school, at least since 10th 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 23.75. That result is added to the percentage of students meeting math ACT benchmarks multiplied by 23.75 for a total of 47.5 points in the accountability model. ACT College Readiness Benchmarks are published by ACT; the benchmarks are currently 18 in English, 22 in Reading, and 22 in Math. ACT develops the benchmarks as a measure of minimum performance on the ACT in each subject area for students to have a reasonable chance of being successful in a first-year credit-bearing college course at a typical college. Students may also meet the CCR indicator by achieving a Silver level National Career Readiness Certificate (NCRC) administered through the ACT WorkKeys assessment and successfully complete an industry certification or career pathway, or achieve a Gold or Platinum NCRC. Students that meet the WorkKeys requirement are included in the CCR measure in the same manner as a student that meets both English or reading and math ACT benchmarks. Students may not exceed 1.0 in the numerator of the average calculation.~~

~~The Acceleration indicator refers to the percentage of students taking and passing the assessment associated with accelerated courses such as Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), Advanced International Certificate of Education (AICE), or MBE-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. Specific details of the calculation are provided below.~~

~~Within the component, 23.75 points are earned from Participation, and 23.75 points are earned from Performance, with a maximum combined score of 47.5 or 50 points. Based on data from 2016-17, points earned on this indicator ranged from 0.5 points to 37.6 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 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			
READING	MATH	SCIENCE	ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRESS
Proficiency **95 PTS**	Proficiency **95 PTS**	Proficiency **95 PTS**	Progress to Proficiency **35 PTS**
Growth All Students **95 PTS**	Growth All Students **95 PTS**		
Growth Lowest 25% **95 PTS**	Growth Lowest 25% **95 PTS**		
700 POINTS POSSIBLE			

NOTE: Participation is measured in each subject. See more in A.4.vii.

DISTRICTS AND SCHOOLS WITH 12TH GRADE					
READING	MATH	SCIENCE	GRADUATION 4-YEAR	COLLEGE & CAREER READINESS	ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRESS
Proficiency **95 PTS**	Proficiency **95 PTS**	Proficiency **47.5 PTS**	4-year Cohort Rate **190 PTS**	Acceleration **47.5 PTS**	Progress to Proficiency **50 PTS**
Growth All Students **95 PTS**	Growth All Students **95 PTS**			Achievement **47.5 PTS**	
Growth Lowest 25% **95 PTS**	Growth Lowest 25% **95 PTS**			Assessment **47.5 PTS**	
1000 POINTS POSSIBLE					

NOTE: Participation is measured in all components.

~~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 in the fall of 2016, and were updated in the fall of 2017 after the second year of MAAP administration.~~

~~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.~~

~~ACCOUNTABILITY SYTSTEM PERFORMANCE LEVEL CUT SCORES~~			
~~GRADE~~	~~DISTRICTS~~	~~ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS~~	~~HIGH SCHOOLS~~
~~A~~	~~668~~	~~442~~	~~754~~
~~B~~	~~599~~	~~377~~	~~648~~
~~C~~	~~536~~	~~328~~	~~584~~
~~D~~	~~489~~	~~269~~	~~510~~
~~F~~	~~<489~~	~~<269~~	~~<510~~

~~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. The Academic Achievement, Other Academic Indicators, Graduation Rate, and Progress in English Language Proficiency each receive substantial weight and much greater weight in the aggregate than the Student Success indicators.

~~Mississippi will use all indicators, including the English Language Proficiency indicator, to identify schools for Comprehensive Support and Improvement or Targeted Support and Improvement in the fall of 2018 and as the basis for calculating exit criteria for these schools. Mississippi will delay inclusion of the English Language Proficiency indicator in official school and district grade calculations until scores are calculated in the fall of 2019.~~

For schools in which the minimum n-count is not met for the English Language Proficiency indicator to be included in calculations, the 5% of total points typically assigned to the ELP indicator will be distributed proportionally among the remaining indicators. This will keep the overall points available consistent at 700 or 1000 points, depending on the

grade-level configuration of the school.

Points earned for each component of the model are based upon the percentage of students meeting criteria for the component. For example, if a 700-point school with an EL population has a mathematics proficiency rate of 60%, the school would earn 57 points (.60 x 95 = 57) for that component.

CURRENT PERCENTAGE WEIGHT OF EACH COMPONENT			
ESSA COMPONENTS	**ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**	**MIDDLE SCHOOL**	**HIGH SCHOOL**
Academic Achievement (ELA Proficiency)	95 ~14% of points	95 ~14% of points	95 ~10% of points
Academic Achievement (Math Proficiency)	95 ~14% of points	95 ~14% of points	95 ~10% of points
Academic Achievement (ELA Growth)	-	-	190 19% of points
Academic Achievement (Math Growth)	-	-	190 19% of points
Other Academic Indicator (ELA Growth)	190 ~27% of points	190 ~27% of points	-
Other Academic Indicator (Math Growth)	190 ~27% of points	190 ~27% of points	-
Graduation Rate	-	-	190 19% of points
English Language Proficiency	35 5% of points	35 5% of points	50 5% of points
Student Success (Science ~~and Social Studies~~ Proficiency and High School Indicators)	95 ~14% of points	95 ~14% of points	190 19% of points
TOTAL POINTS	**700**	**700**	**1000**

BREAKING OUT THE INDICATORS BY COMPONENTS AT THE SCHOOL LEVEL			
SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENT	**WEIGHT IN OVERALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL GRADE**	**WEIGHT IN OVERALL MIDDLE SCHOOL GRADE**	**WEIGHT IN OVERALL HIGH SCHOOL GRADE**
Academic Achievement: Reading Proficiency	95	95	95
Academic Achievement: Math Proficiency	95	95	95
Academic Achievement: Reading Growth	-	-	190
Academic Achievement: Math Growth	-	-	190
Other Academic Indicator: Reading Growth	190	190	-
Other Academic Indicator: Math Growth	190	190	-
Other Academic Indicator: Four-Year Graduation Rate	-	-	190
Student Success: Science Proficiency	95	95	47.5
Student Success: College and Career Readiness	-	-	142.5
English Language Proficiency: Progress to Proficiency	35	35	50
TOTAL POINTS	**700**	**700**	**1000**

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.

For 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 full academic year (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 for the lack of this component, such that the school is assigned a composite score on the 700-point scale using an equipercentile linking from the remaining 600 possible points.

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 for the lack of this component, such that the school is assigned a composite score on the 700-point scale using an equipercentile linking from the remaining 600 possible points.

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 for the lack of this component, such that the school is assigned a composite score on the 700-point scale using an equipercentile linking from the remaining 600 possible points.

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 for the lack of this component, such that the school is assigned a composite score on the 700-point scale using an equipercentile linking from the remaining 600 possible points.

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.

High Schools

Schools with missing data for components specific to high schools will have available proxy data applied in the following order of availability; three (3) year historical school average, two (2) year historical school average, prior year school score, current year district score, prior year district score. If no proxy data is available, an equating process will be used to adjust for the missing components.

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.

The MDE, school districts, and schools are working with a sense of urgency to improve the lowest performing schools and increase access to quality learning opportunities for children in Mississippi's schools. The MDE, through the work of leaders and teachers within the state and high leverage partnerships with organizations such as the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), Center on School Turnaround, Johns Hopkins University, Chiefs for Change, Academic Development Institute, and the Mississippi State University Research and Curriculum Unit, will diligently seek out and promote the use of those effective instructional practices that have strong evidence of effectiveness. Each partner provides a degree of support and assists with promoting initiatives across the agency. Such partnerships enable the Office of School Improvement to subscribe to the following theory of action:

If the Office of School Improvement collaborates with district and school leaders to enhance leadership practices that support school transformation, then district and school leaders' capacity to make results-based decisions will be strengthened; and

If their capacity to make results-based decisions is strengthened, then district and school leaders will embed a culture of success and cultivate a sense of belonging within their systems.

This theory of action is further supported by research that promotes a focus on the following key principles and foundational competencies demonstrated by districts and schools to bring about rapid and sustainable improvement.

- Providing strong leadership
- Ensuring effective teaching and improved instruction
- Increasing learning time
- Strengthening school instructional programs
- Using data to inform instruction for continuous improvement
- Improving school safety and discipline
- Providing ongoing mechanism for family and community engagement
- Ensuring school receives ongoing assistance and related support

The Center on School Turnaround's research addressing domains of rapid improvement provides a framework by which Mississippi's improvement efforts can be aligned to four key areas to drive its school improvement work. The domains, turnaround leadership, talent development, instructional transformation, and culture shift provide a needed framework for categorizing prior improvement work as the state transitions to implementation of the requirements of ESSA for identifying and supporting its low performing schools.

The Center on School Turnaround. (2017). Four domains for rapid school improvement: A systems framework [The Center for School Turnaround at WestEd]. San Francisco, CA: WestEd.

See the graphic below for a comprehensive overview of identification and exit criteria, as well as timelines and supports for each category. In addition to the identification of schools for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) and Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), 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. While the law allows for school or district identification, the MDE plans to identify entire districts to become a part of the ASD.

Additionally, Mississippi law allows for a District of Transformation model, wherein the state may assign an interim superintendent to 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. In accordance with this law, the district will be eligible to return to local control when the district has met all conditions related to district transformation and has maintained a "C" or higher for five consecutive years if the district was rated a "D" or "F" when placed into district

transformation.

Regardless of the identified category, school improvement efforts will include a focus on building local capacity through professional development for teachers and administrators, improved community support through community engagement councils, formerly referred to as P-16 councils, other groups, and strengthened parent engagement through school-based activities.

CONTINUUM OF SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT CATEGORIES

~~ACHIEVEMENT SCHOOL DISTRICT~~ DISTRICT OF TRANSFORMATION

DISTRICT IDENTIFICATION METHOD in accordance with Mississippi Code, Annotated, 37-17-~~176~~(12)(b)(ii), may include a school or district labeled as "F" for 2 consecutive years, or 2 out of 3 consecutive years, or during each of 4 consecutive school years, receives a "D" or "F" designation by the State Board of Education under the accountability rating system or has been persistently failing as defined by the State Board of Education; or if more than fifty percent (50%) of the schools within a school district are designated as Schools-At-Risk in any one year.

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 within the ASD is so identified, as well as full governance of school by State Department of Education

COMPREHENSIVE SUPPORT & IMPROVEMENT

SCHOOL IDENTIFICATION METHOD

1. graduation rate less than or equal to 67% (~~identification in 2018-19 based on 2017-18 data; subsequent~~ identification every 3rd year); **OR**
2. bottom 5% of Title IA schools (~~identification in 2018-19 based on 2017-18 data; subsequent~~ identification every 3rd year; identification ~~in 2022-2023 and subsequent years~~ will use the most recent 3 years of data); **OR**
3. previously identified Additional TSI school with 3 consecutive years of subgroup proficiency performance (ELA or math) at or below that of all students in the bottom 5% of Title IA schools ~~(identification for this group to begin in 2021-22)~~

EXIT (SCHOOL IDENTIFICATION METHOD #1) after 3 years, graduation rate above 67%

EXIT (SCHOOL IDENTIFICATION METHOD #2) after 3 years:

- above the bottom 5% of Title IA schools;

AND

- an increase in the accountability index score from the year of identification. ~~accountability letter grade; **OR**~~
- ~~an increase in the accountability letter grade that crosses over the midpoint of the letter grade. (For example, bottom half of "F" to top half of "F")~~

EXIT (SCHOOL IDENTIFICATION METHOD #3) after 1 year:

- the 3-yr. average subgroup performance is above that of all students in the lowest performing schools (lowest 5% of Title 1A schools based on identification year data);

AND

- an increase in the accountability index score of the subgroup from

TARGETED SUPPORT & IMPROVEMENT

SCHOOL IDENTIFICATION METHOD

- Subgroup in lowest 50% of overall accountability index; **AND**
- Subgroup in lowest quartile of 3-year average gap-to-goal; **AND**
- Subgroup scores in lowest quartile of 3-year improvement toward gap-to-goal closure
- Schools with a subgroup meeting all 3 of the above criteria will be rank-ordered *annually,* using overall accountability index, and bottom 5% of all schools not identified for CSI will be identified for TSI

EXIT

~~In 2023, schools must meet Part 1 and Part 2a. In 2024 and subsequent years, schools must meet Part 1 and Part 2b.~~

PART 1: School no longer meets criteria above that led to initial identification;

AND

PART 2:

~~a.~~ ~~1-year (2022-2023) subgroup growth score is 50 or greater in the Fall of 2023~~

~~b.~~ 3-year average subgroup growth score is 50 or greater ~~in Fall 2024 (2023-2024, 2022-2023, 2021-2022) and subsequent years.~~

SCHOOL IDENTIFICATION METHOD FOR ADDITIONAL TSI for all schools, 3-year average subgroup performance is at or below that of all students in the lowest performing schools (bottom 5% of Title IA schools) ~~(identification in 2018-19 based on 2015-16, 2016-17, and 2017-18 data; subsequent 3-year identification based on most recent 3-year data trend)~~

the year of identification as CSI. ~~accountability letter grade; **OR**~~

- ~~an increase in the letter grade that crosses over the midpoint of the accountability letter grade (for example, bottom half of "F" to the top half of "F")~~

SUPPORTS
(Bottom 30% at a minimum): face-to-face and/or virtual coaching support; access to formula grants; professional learning with priority access to MDE Professional Development Services. **The percentage of schools receiving coaching support may be impacted and modified based on availability of personnel.*

EXIT

- subgroup performance above that of all students in the lowest performing schools (bottom 5% of Title IA schools), based on identification year data;

AND

- an increase in the accountability index score from the year of identification. ~~accountability letter grade; **OR**~~
- ~~an increase in the accountability letter grade that crosses over the midpoint of the letter grade. (For example, bottom half of "F" to top half of "F")~~

SUPPORTS evidence-based interventions as outlined in TSI plan approved by the local school board and implemented by the school district; if funding is available once CSI schools are served, TSI schools will have access to grant funding and professional learning.

COMPREHENSIVE SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES

School Has Primary Responsibility

- ☐ Complete comprehensive needs assessment to determine root cause(s) focus areas: Achievement, Fiscal and Human Resources, Instructional Capacity, Early Warning Mechanisms, Multi-Tiered System of Support Implementation effectiveness
- ☐ Develop plan to address identified areas and resource inequities; must be board approved and aligned with Title I Schoolwide Plan; document plan and implementation progress; all activities in plan must be based on the required levels of evidence (Strong, Moderate, Promising)

- ☐ Create a school leadership team to regularly address progress toward areas causing underperformance
- ☐ Reserve 20% of its Title I allocation to support evidence-based interventions for areas causing underperformance (all activities must be based on the required levels of evidence (Strong, Moderate, Promising)
- ☐ Present monthly progress update on plan implementation to District Leadership team and local school board (must be a standing item on the School Board Agenda)

District Has Primary Responsibility

- ☐ Review and provide feedback on plan prior to submitting for board approval (Instructional and Fiscal Review)
- ☐ Track progress of school, quarterly, to ensure fidelity to plan implementation
- ☐ Ensure district leadership team engages schools in professional learning through collaborative discussions on current and relevant achievement data, school culture/climate, and instructional decisions
- ☐ Conduct end-of-year review of school's progress
- ☐ Establish and regularly engage Community Engagement Council

MDE Has Primary Responsibility

- ☐ Approve, monitor, and review plan
- ☐ Funding to support evidence-based interventions for improving student achievement
- ☐ Provide technical assistance as requested/needed
- ☐ Provide professional learning that is focused on key areas for improvement/aligned to comprehensive needs assessment areas

TARGETED SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES

School Has Primary Responsibility

- ☐ Complete comprehensive needs assessment to determine root cause(s) focus areas: Achievement, Fiscal and Human Resources, Instructional Capacity, Early Warning Mechanisms, Multi-Tiered System of Support Implementation effectiveness
- ☐ Develop plan to address identified focus areas for subgroup(s), must be board approved and aligned with Title I Schoolwide Plan – document plan and implementation progress; all activities in plan must be based on the required levels of evidence (Strong, Moderate, Promising)
- ☐ Create a school leadership team to regularly address progress toward areas causing underperformance
- ☐ Reserve 20% of its Title I allocation to support evidence-based interventions for subgroup(s) causing underperformance (all activities must be based on the required levels of evidence (Strong, Moderate, Promising)
- ☐ Present monthly progress update on plan implementation to District Leadership team and local school board (must be a standing item on the School Board Agenda)
- ☐ Notify parents regarding identification and subgroup(s) performance annually

District Has Primary Responsibility

- ☐ Review and provide feedback on plan prior to submitting for board approval (Instructional and Fiscal Review)
- ☐ Track progress of school in meeting subgroup(s) needs, on a quarterly basis, to ensure fidelity to plan implementation
- ☐ Ensure district leadership team engages schools in professional learning through collaborative discussions on current and relevant achievement data, school culture/climate, and instructional decisions
- ☐ Conduct End of year review of school's progress
- ☐ Establish and regularly engage parents and community members

MDE Has Primary Responsibility

- ☐ Funding to support evidence-based interventions for improving student achievement (if available)
- ☐ Provide access to technical assistance as requested/needed
- ☐ Provide access to professional development that is focused on key areas for improvement/aligned to comprehensive needs assessment areas

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.

~~**ATSI Schools Identified in Fall 2022**~~

~~Year 1~~	~~Year 2~~	~~Year 3~~	~~Year 4~~	~~**Year to become CSI if no Exit**~~
~~2022-23~~	~~2023-24~~	~~2024-25~~	~~2025-26~~	~~2026-27~~

~~Mississippi is revising the state-determined number of years from 3 to 4 years for the 2018 cohort of ATSI schools.~~

~~An ATSI school identified in 2018 would become a CSI school in the fall of 2023 instead of the fall of 2022 if it does not exit.~~

~~**ATSI Schools Identified in Fall 2018**~~

~~Year 1~~	~~Year 2~~	~~Year 3~~	~~Year 4~~	~~**Year to become CSI if no Exit**~~
~~2018-19~~	~~2019-20~~	~~2021-22~~	~~2022-23~~	~~2023-24~~

~~Mississippi is not revising the state-determined number of years for ATSI schools that were identified in 2019-20. An ATSI school identified in 2019 would become a CSI school in the fall of 2023.~~

~~**ATSI Schools Identified in Fall 2019**~~

~~Year 1~~	~~Year 2~~	~~Year 3~~	~~**Year to become CSI if no Exit**~~

~~2019-20~~	~~2021-22~~	~~2022-23~~	~~2023-24~~

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))*

See above graphic.

A "consistently underperforming" subgroup is a subgroup of students that (a) scores in the lowest 50% on the overall accountability index results, (b) scores in the lowest quartile of average reading/language arts or mathematics gap-to-goal (current percent proficient less the 70% long-term goal) for the most recent three years of accountability calculations, and (c) scores in the lowest quartile of improvement toward reading/language arts or mathematics gap-to-goal closure over three years. Schools not identified for CSI, and with subgroups meeting criteria (a), (b), and (c), above, will be rank ordered highest to lowest based on the most recent overall accountability index (including all indicators), and the lowest-performing schools will be identified for TSI annually. The number of schools identified will be based on the total number of public schools in Mississippi, resulting in 5% of all public schools being identified for TSI.

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))*

See above graphic.

For identification purposes, a three-year average accountability index will be calculated for all Title IA schools. Title IA schools will then be rank ordered to identify the score corresponding to the 5th percentile of Title IA schools. This 5th percentile score establishes the threshold for identification of Additional TSI schools.

Subgroup three-year average accountability index scores will be calculated for all schools. All schools with a subgroup three-year average accountability index that is at or below the 5th percentile threshold will be identified. Identification will occur every 3 years.

g. ADDITIONAL STATEWIDE CATEGORIES OF SCHOOLS

If the State chooses, at its discretion, to include additional statewide categories of schools, describe those categories.

Mississippi is not identifying additional categories of schools to meet federal requirements. The MDE will, however, identify districts under state law. Within the school improvement continuum for student performance, Mississippi law has established a District of Transformation (DOT) as described in the above graphic~~, to be launched in the 2018-19 school year~~. ~~While the law allows for school or district identification, the MDE plans to identify entire districts to become a part of the ASD.~~

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 in required statewide assessments or approved Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Assessment as described in Miss. Admin. Code 7-3: 78.11, State Board Policy Chapter 78, Rule 78.11 Guidelines for Mississippi's Implementation of the Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized, High School Assessment, 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.

See above graphic.

~~By requiring an increase in the accountability letter grade ("F" to "D", or an increase in the accountability that crosses over the midpoint of the letter grade (for example, bottom half of "F" to top half of "F"), Mississippi is ensuring that a school demonstrates improvement compared to prior performance.~~

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.

See above graphic.

~~By requiring an increase in the accountability letter grade ("F" to "D", or an increase in the accountability that crosses over the midpoint of the letter grade (for example, bottom half of "F" to top half of "F"), Mississippi is ensuring that a school demonstrates improvement compared to prior performance.~~

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.

The MDE will take a more prescriptive approach to activities conducted in the school. All schools identified for CSI that fail to meet the State's exit criteria within a State-determined number of years will be required to implement evidence-based interventions that meet the "strong" or "moderate" levels of evidence as defined in ESSA, in addition to providing evidentiary support that an intervention meeting this criteria has been implemented.

~~Mississippi is revising the state-determined number of years a school identified for comprehensive support and improvement in fall 2022 has to meet the statewide exit criteria in order to exit status to 4 years from 3 years before it must take a state-determined more rigorous action. CSI schools identified in the fall of 2023 will begin more rigorous options (MRO) if they do not exit after 3 years of identification (see tables)~~

~~CSI Schools identified in Fall 2022~~

~~Year 1~~	~~Year 2~~	~~Year 3~~	~~Year 4~~	~~More Rigorous Options~~

				~~begins, if no exit~~
~~2022-23~~	~~2023-24~~	~~2024-25~~	~~2025-26~~	~~2026-27~~

~~**CSI Schools identified in Fall 2023**~~

~~Year 1~~	~~Year 2~~	~~Year 3~~	~~More Rigorous Options begins, if no exit~~
~~2023-24~~	~~2024-25~~	~~2025-26~~	~~2026-27~~

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.

The MDE periodically examines the resource allocation through a formal interview process, the MDE meets with district and school level leaders, to examine expenditures, student performance data, and other relevant data. LEA and school leaders receive feedback for consideration to support decision-making to further develop or refine plans for improvement.

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.

See above graphic.

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.

i. 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).~~, 37-17-176(12)(b)(ii), schools or districts labeled as "F" for 2 consecutive years, or 2 out of 3 consecutive

years, or during each of 4 consecutive school years, receives a "D" or "F" designation by the State Board of Education under the accountability rating system or has been persistently failing as defined by the State Board of Education; or if more than fifty percent (50%) of the schools within a school district are designated as Schools-At-Risk in any one year, the school or district may be placed into a District of Transformation.

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.