



Protocol – Indicator 17

Essential Elements

Indicator Description

The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities.

The State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)*

The State has selected a SiMR for children with disabilities that is aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator, and that is a child-level outcome.

To increase the percentage of grade three students with a Specific Learning Disability, Other Health Impairment, and Language/Speech rulings in targeted districts who pass the regular statewide reading assessment.

Additional notes from the Universal Technical Assistance document:

1. Child and student outcomes, as discussed in the context of the SiMR, must be a child- or student-level outcome in contrast to a process of outcome.
2. The state may select a single result (e.g., increasing reading proficiency for students with disabilities, knowledge and skills for infants and toddlers), or a cluster of results that improve child outcomes.
3. Not all results indicators are approvable for the SiMR, but they may be incorporated into Indicator 17 as an outcome for a specific improvement strategy that ultimately affects the SiMR.
4. SiMRs based on the following results indicators would not be acceptable for stand-alone SiMRs: Indicator 2, Indicator 4, Indicators 5 and 6, Indicator 8, Indicators 15 and 16.

Measurement

The SSIP includes the components that follow:

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the SiMR(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY



(expressed as percentages), and that data must be aligned with the SiMR(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFY 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2023	11.35

Targets (greater than)

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	Baseline	21.35%	26.35%

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data (greater than)

Number of 3 rd graders with SLD, OHI and LS in targeted districts who passed the regular statewide reading assessment	*Number of 3 rd graders with SLD, OHI, and LS in targeted districts who took the regular statewide reading assessment	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Data	Stat, us	Slippage
		6.5 %	16.35 %	61.6 %	35.7 %	Met Target	

Stakeholder Engagement:

Special ED Advisory panel is used for stakeholder engagement. Meetings with the advisory panel are held monthly via Zoom or in-person. The advisory panel helps with targets and suggestions for training with districts and dissemination. Official minutes must be kept on all SEAP meetings and must be made available to the public on request.

For target and baseline setting for results indicators:

1. There was a series of virtual meetings with parents and for the public to review data and set targets. Special education directors are also included.



2. There are 12 parents of a child with a disability and 4 parent members of organizations out of 27 members on the panel that engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement activities, and evaluating progress.
3. Attendance is tracked by roll call at the beginning of each meeting, and members are marked present or absent on an attendance form. The Research Specialist takes roll and provides the parent engage
4. In-person training was provided to all panel members on October 22, 2025, from the Program Director, Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) at Utah State University. Topics included:
 - a. Purpose for the Special Education Advisory Panel Under IDEA
 - b. Knowing and Understanding the Panel By-laws
 - c. IDEA Regulations Regarding the Advisory Panel
 - d. The Panel in the Context of the History of Special Education
 - e. The Relationships Between Part C of IDEA, Section 619, and Part B of IDEA
 - f. Required Membership of the Advisory Panel Under IDEA
 - g. Working as an Advisory Panel
 - h. Duties of the Advisory Panel Under IDEA
 - i. Panel Meeting Procedures
 - j. The Panel and OSEP Related Items – General Supervision/APR and DMS
 - k. Establishing Annual Advisory Panel Priorities
 - l. Current Issues in Special Education and their Possible Impact on the Advisory Panel
5. These meetings were advertised on website, flyers were sent to districts for students to take home to parents, districts and parent centers were also notified regarding virtual meetings.
6. There was a series of ~7 zoom meetings, to collect feedback and answer questions. There was an overview of the indicators, and historical data was presented to review trends. Suggested targets were provided, and comments were recorded. Questions and comments centered on actual data and how the data impacts children. Chat and verbal discussion were used to collect feedback.
7. Meetings are held on weekends, evenings, and at lunch to maximize the availability of people. These were held from November through January.
8. Meets at least four times per year.
 - a. Solicits nominations for membership from interested parties, including parents.
 - b. These meetings serve as the primary mechanism for gathering input on target settings, data analysis, and strategy development. The timeline is aligned with the administrative year (July 1 – June 30).
9. An annual report of SEAP activities and suggestions to the SEA, which must be made publicly available.
10. Results of meetings, target settings, and data analysis etc. are discussed in the APR.



There is also an annual parent conference in partnership with the Mississippi Parent Training and Information Center, which is also open to teachers and directors. The data are presented during the conference, and targets are discussed during this meeting. The data is shared with the SSIP Task Force group to gain input on how the State should proceed based on the data. The members include current and former special education directors, parents of current and former students with disabilities. The information was then shared with an Internal Task Force group to get additional feedback. The members included the transition specialist, engagement specialist, and monitoring specialist. The OSE held Family Focus Nights for districts and parents to get feedback on their perceptions of the district's literacy instruction and their involvement in the development of their student's IEP. During these meetings data was presented that allowed stakeholders to provide feedback verbally or via anonymous surveys as to the appropriateness and attainability of the proposed revision of the SiMR which was to increase the percentage of grade three students with a Specific Learning Disability, Other Health Impairment, and Language/Speech rulings in targeted districts who pass the regular statewide reading assessment to by FFY 2025.

Target Setting:

See response directly above.

Data Stewards:

1. Director of Data Analysis and Reporting, OTSS: Provides schools' 3rd grade ELA MAAP Data for OHI, SLD, L/S students who scored proficiency levels 3, 4, 5
2. The SSIP Literacy Coordinator: Compiles and disseminates SSIP support school data for review with all stakeholders twice annually. The Coordinator also reviews each schools' data with coaches monthly and ensures alignment to support being provided. The coordinator also receives data from Infrastructure and Literacy Capacity surveys.
3. The SSIP Regional Literacy Coordinators and Coaches are responsible for data collection in the following ways: Report school level Universal Screener data for support schools three times a year and meet with teachers to create a plan for instruction and/or interventions based on the data. Analyzes support school data (benchmark, progress monitoring, etc.) with support teachers to plan instruction on a monthly or bi-monthly basis.

Theory of Action

[Theory-of-Action-FY24.pdf](#)

Our review-and-revision schedule is annually via our SSIP Literacy Task Force.



Evaluation Plan

[Evaluation-FFY24.pdf](#)

Our review-and-revision schedule is annually via our SSIP Literacy Task Force.

Data Processes

SSIP includes several different types of data including: (1) SiMR data; (2) additional data (i.e., benchmark, continuous quality improvement, or surveys) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR; (3) infrastructure outcomes; (4) fidelity data; and (5) progress monitoring data related to evidence-based practices and support for those practices.

The database MDE uses to process data for the SiMR is MSIS

1. Option 1: One target for measurement.
 - a. Define the SiMR numerator. # of 3rd grade students in targeted districts identified as OHI, SLD, L/S that took the ELA MAAP assessment and scored proficiency levels 3, 4, or 5
 - b. Define the SiMR denominator. # of 3rd grade students in targeted districts identified as OHI, SLD, L/S that took the ELA MAAP assessment
2. Option 2: Two targets for measurement.
 - a. Define the Part A SiMR numerator.
 - b. Define the Part A SiMR denominator.
 - c. Define the Part B SiMR numerator.
 - d. Define the Part B SiMR denominator.

SiMR Data Collection

The SSIP Literacy Coordinator submits a helpdesk ticket to OTSS/MSIS to request the SiMR data from MSIS. OTSS data analysts pull the data and update the helpdesk ticket with the requested data. The Literacy Coordinator sends an email to the helpdesk system requesting the data in the first week of July. Here is the data requested:

1. Percentage of students statewide who scored levels 3, 4, and 5 on the 3rd grade ELA MAAP assessment
2. Percentage students with SLD, Speech/Language and OHI ruling statewide scoring levels 3, 4, and 5 on the 3rd grade ELA MAAP assessment
3. Percentage of 3rd grade students with SLD, Speech/Language and OHI ruling from each elementary school SSIP Literacy Support school that scored levels 3, 4, and 5 on the ELA MAAP assessment



IDEA Section 618 data

The SiMR focuses on 3rd grade ELA MAAP data from targeted SSIP Literacy support schools. SSIP literacy support schools are determined by:

1. Grade three MAAP ELA data of SLD, OHI, and LS of current SSIP districts
2. Special Education Determination Reports using the determination level obtained by the district
3. School Intervention Data targeting schools that are identified as Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI)

SiMR Data Validation

The SiMR data is pulled from state-wide accountability, assessment, and special education data. These data domains are validated through a series of data quality domain edits that run against all data sets. LEA-submitted data must be reviewed and corrected for any errors and/or warnings before the data is certified. Only certified data is used for SiMR data. Assessment and accountability data sets are validated through MDE respective offices and also through a district review and appeal process.

Consider connecting to the relevant IDEA Section 616 or 618 data protocol(s) for information related to validating these data.

SiMR Data Analysis

The SiMR is analyzed each year by disability category, schools, and the state. The SSIP Literacy Coordinator, SSIP Regional Literacy Coordinators, and SSIP Literacy Coaches review the data to determine if the scores increased from the previous school year. On monthly reports there is a section for concerns to be listed that may prevent coaching from being successful. These concerns then are addressed to the SSIP and school staff (coach and administrators) for possible solutions. Also, at the end of each school year each coach completes a comprehensive report by school that includes areas of concerns. If slippage occurs, this data would be re-analyzed to see if it was a factor. We look for patterns such as administrator/teacher turnover to see if it had an effect on data (school performance dropped or gap widen).

Review SiMR data year-to-year and disaggregate by subgroups (e.g., by race/ethnicity, age or grade level, sex, disability category), looking for patterns statewide and within LEAs, outliers, information about whether targets are met or not met, and slippage. Compare aggregated and disaggregated scores over time to see if gaps are shrinking or widening.



Additional Data Source Description

Universal screening assessments are administered to all students (K-12) at least (3) three times during the year to provide an especially critical “first look” at individual students. State statute requires that the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) “shall select early literacy and numeracy screening assessment instrument or instruments to be used throughout the state in the screening of students in Kindergarten through Grade 3” (Mississippi Code § 37-23-16; Mississippi Code § 37-177-5). Diagnostic Assessments are administered to students who fail the screening assessment. Diagnostic assessments provide in-depth information about individual students’ particular strengths and needs for Tier 2 supplemental instruction and/or Tier 3 intensive intervention. Parents/Guardians of students in Kindergarten, First, Second, or Third Grade whose universal screener score indicates that the students’ reading ability is below grade level and the student may need an additional diagnostic reading assessment to determine if a substantial reading deficiency exists receive a notification letter. Parents are notified quarterly (in writing) with each progress report until the reading deficiency is remediated. According to MS Code 37-177-1, students exhibiting a substantial reading deficiency at any time in grades K-3 MUST BE provided intensive reading interventions following the identification of the reading deficiency based on a diagnostic assessment. The intensive reading instruction and intervention must be documented for each student in an Individual Reading Plan. Additional data collected and reviewed in our comprehensive reports are teacher turnover rate and absenteeism. That is collected by each school's literacy coach from the office manager.

Additional Data Collection and Submission Schedule

Students are administered by the Beginning of the Year (BOY), Middle of the Year (MOY), and End of the Year (EOY) universal screener to evaluate if growth was made over time and determine what, if any, instructional interventions are warranted. This data piece is collected by districts and submitted to the Office of Student Assessment via a spreadsheet. The due dates are provided yearly. This year’s due dates are September 19, 2025, December 19, 2025, and May 15, 2026. Reimbursement for the screeners is an incentive for the districts to comply with. However, our coaches are providing access to Screener data by the districts to make real-time intervention plans with teachers. Students also are given benchmark assessments in districts at least quarterly (one per school term) that the schools provide the coaches to use with teachers to develop teaching/intervening plans.

Additional Data Collection

Learning Walks are conducted in SSIP Literacy support schools as an opportunity for administrators and literacy coaches to obtain a brief snapshot of instruction and



learning in the classroom. The SSIP Literacy Coach that supports each school leads the walk. Required members of the team are SSIP Literacy Coach, SSIP Literacy Coordinator, SSIP Support Specialist, SSIP Technical Assistance, principal, and SPED Director. Observation data was collected using the MDE Learning Walk protocol which includes the following elements: 1) instruction (application of concepts), 2) instruction (instructional strategies), 3) classroom atmosphere and preparation/planning, 4) writing and literacy centers. During a debrief after the Learning Walk, the team develops Commendations, Recommendations, and Next Steps by grade level. This information is put into a Learning Walk Outcomes report. This data then is used by the coach and principal to create a school literacy action plan to direct literacy support provided.

Additional Data Validation

The Mississippi Department of Education, in collaboration with the Mississippi Reading Panel, has established an approved list of reading screeners to be used by local school districts in grades K-3. The schools' Universal Screener data must come from the approved list of reading screeners. Data validity was one of five technical criteria the team used to determine the list of approved screeners.

Additional Data Analysis

The school level Universal Screener data for support schools is analyzed three times a year, here are the end dates of each testing window provided by MDE for this SY (September 19, 2025, December 19, 2025, and May 15, 2026), and SSIP Literacy Coaches meet with support teachers to create a plan for instruction and/or interventions based on the data. The coaching staff also analyze support school data (benchmark, progress monitoring, etc.) with support teachers to plan instruction on a monthly or bi-monthly basis. Learning Walk data is analyzed and used to develop a School Literacy Action Plan that includes SMART goals, person responsible, timeline, resources, evidence of progress, dates completed, and evidence of sustainability. The School Literacy Action plans are due from each school by November 15th. The SSIP Literacy Coach and principal collaborate to develop the plan based on the Next Steps from Learning Walks.

Infrastructure Outcomes Data Source Description

SSIP schools were asked to participate in a District/School Infrastructure Analysis Survey. Districts/Schools were asked to analyze the data to identify trends. The average of the respondents on a scale of 1-5 in the following areas:

1. Educational Management & Leadership
2. Professional Development



3. Planning & Instruction
4. Assessment
5. IDEA Indicators
6. District Level Support

This is sent out via Google Forms by the Literacy Coordinator to the SPED Directors of SSIP Literacy Support schools to disseminate to administrators and teachers to complete the surveys. SSIP Literacy Coaches follow up in the building to ensure completion. After the due date of completion, the Literacy Coordinator downloads and separates the data by district and provides the SPED Director to analyze and develop necessary supports based on the data gathered.

Infrastructure Outcomes Collection and Submission Schedule

1. The surveys are sent out during the Fall Semester, and data is pulled during December.
2. This is sent out via Google Forms by the Literacy Coordinator to the SPED Directors of SSIP Literacy Support schools to disseminate administrators and teachers to complete the surveys.
3. SSIP Literacy Coaches follow up in the building to ensure completion.
4. The SSIP Literacy Coordinator pulls the data and shares it with the SPED Director.
 - a. when data are due from LEAs, if relevant
 - b. when assigned staff pull the data after the collection closes

Infrastructure Outcomes Data Collection

Teachers complete the surveys via an online platform. The data is collected by the SSIP Literacy Coordinator, disaggregated, and calculated for each school.

Infrastructure Outcomes Data Validation

Describe the additional data cleaning processes and any other processes the SEA uses to ensure high-quality data. If applicable, describe the roles and requirements that LEAs have for data validation and ensuring high-quality data.

Infrastructure Outcomes Data Analysis

Describe the process for infrastructure outcomes of data analysis.

Once the data is collected and scored, it is disseminated to the districts. The data can be used to develop professional development or as a self-reflection tool for schools/districts.



Fidelity Data Processes

Fidelity Data Source Description

Provide a short description of the database or data system the SEA uses to process data that measures fidelity of implementation and assesses practice change.

SSIP Literacy Coach Monthly Reports are submitted to the building administrator and the MDE OSE. The coaches conduct observations and coaching at grade-level and/or school-wide. Professional Development is provided with the coach indicating the topics, audience, and number of participants. Monthly site visits are conducted to determine the effectiveness of literacy coach practices and what support may be needed to enhance support provided to the schools. Data Analysis is conducted based on data from universal screeners such as i-Ready and STAR Early Literacy, assessments, teacher-student ratio, etc. Survey data from Phonics First® will be collected to determine the effectiveness of the training and their ability to transfer the new knowledge into the classroom.

Fidelity Data Collection and Submission Schedule

Provide a list of dates necessary for the data collection, including

1. Coaching reports are submitted monthly.
2. Screener data is collected three times per year.
3. Phonics First data is collected once per year.
 - a. the data collection period
 - b. when data are due from LEAs, if relevant
 - c. when assigned staff pull the data after the collection closes

Fidelity Data Collection

Provide detailed information about the origin and collection of the fidelity data, including titles of the persons responsible for collecting and calculating the data. SSIP Literacy Coaches conduct learning walks twice a year (Fall and Spring) and classroom observations throughout the school year.

Fidelity Data Validation

Describe the additional data cleaning processes and any other processes the SEA uses to ensure high-quality data. If applicable, describe the roles and requirements that LEAs have for data validation and ensuring high-quality data.



MAAP data and state-wide accountability assessment data are validated by both LEAs and the Office of Student Assessment to ensure high-quality data is provided.

Fidelity Data Analysis

Describe the process for fidelity data analysis, including fidelity thresholds.

Progress Monitoring Data Processes*

*Progress monitoring data may be collected and reported but is not an OSEP requirement.

Progress Monitoring Data Source Description

Provide a short description of the database or data system the SEA uses to process any additional data, such as progress monitoring data, that is related to the use of evidence-based practices.

Students will be administered by the Beginning of the Year (BOY), Middle of the Year (MOY) and End of the Year (EOY) universal screener to evaluate if growth was made over time and determine what, if any, instructional interventions are warranted. Diagnostic assessments provide in-depth information about individual students' particular strengths and needs for Tier 2 supplemental instruction and/or Tier 3 intensive intervention. Parents/Guardians of students in Kindergarten, First, Second, or Third Grade whose universal screener score indicates that the students' reading ability is below grade level and the student may need an additional diagnostic reading assessment to determine if a substantial reading deficiency exists receive a notification letter. Parents are notified quarterly (in writing) with each progress report until the reading deficiency is remediated. According to MS Code 37-177-1, students exhibiting a substantial reading deficiency at any time in grades K-3 MUST BE provided intensive reading interventions following the identification of the reading deficiency based on a diagnostic assessment. The intensive reading instruction and intervention must be documented for each student in an Individual Reading Plan. SSIP Literacy Coach Monthly Reports are submitted to the building administrator and the MDE OSE. The coaches conduct observations and coaching at grade-level and/or school-wide. Professional Development is provided with the coach indicating the topics, audience, and number of participants. Monthly site visits are conducted to determine the effectiveness of literacy coach practices and what support may be needed to enhance support provided to the schools. The SSIP literacy coaches will conduct Winter Learning Walks to determine if teachers made instructional adjustments based on the Next Steps from the Fall Learning Walks and School Literacy Action Plan that was developed.

Progress Monitoring Data Collection and Submission Schedule

Provide a list of dates necessary for the data collection, including



1. the data collection period
2. when data are due from LEAs, if relevant
3. when assigned staff pull the data after the collection closes

SSIP Literacy Coaches are given access to the Universal Screener data by the districts.

SSIP Literacy coaches pull that data three times a year based on the Universal Screener Schedule developed from MDE's Office of Student Assessment (Beginning of the Year, Middle of the Year, and End of the Year). SSIP literacy coaches collect diagnostic data from the diagnostics that are given based on the screener data three times a year as well.

SSIP Literacy Coaches also collect the Learning Walk data twice a year (Fall and Spring).

Progress Monitoring Data Collection

Provide detailed information about the origin and collection of the progress of monitoring data, including titles of the persons responsible for collecting and calculating the data.

SSIP Literacy Coaches collect Screener data three times a year; school benchmark data quarterly, Learning Walk data twice a year.

Progress Monitoring Data Validation

Describe the additional data cleaning processes and any other processes the SEA uses to ensure high-quality data. If applicable, describe the roles and requirements that LEAs have for data validation and ensuring high-quality data.

The Mississippi Department of Education, in collaboration with the Mississippi Reading Panel, has established an approved list of reading screeners to be used by local school districts in grades K-3. The schools' Universal Screener data must come from the approved list of reading screeners. Data validity was one of five technical criteria the team used to determine the list of approved screeners.

Progress Monitoring Data Analysis

Describe the process for progress monitoring data analysis.

SSIP Literacy Coaches analyze screener data in data PLCs with teachers to determine if further diagnostics are necessary to accurately determine the student's reading deficit. Then individual interventions are developed for each student according to the data. During monthly site visits, professional growth activities are provided based on coaches'



individual goals. Learning Walk data is used by the coach and building level administrator to develop a School Literacy Action Plan that includes SMART goals, person responsible, timeline, resources, evidence of progress, dates completed, and evidence of sustainability.

Data Use and Reporting Processes

Data Use for SiMR and SSIP Continuation Decisions

States must conduct system analysis activities and data analysis if a decision is made to change the SiMR, and states must consider evaluation data when determining whether to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications.

The SSIP Literacy Coordinator receives data from OTSS pertaining to the grade three MAAP. The coordinator, with the SSIP Regional Literacy Coordinators, and SSIP Literacy Coaches also analyze supports given to schools throughout the school year to determine if changes are needed to ensure evidence- based practices are being provided to students and that data is being collected with fidelity.

Data Governance

Describe the process for reviewing and approving potential or actual changes to the data collection and associated requirements, including security and privacy. Identify the state staff responsible for this activity.

The SSIP Literacy Coordinator collaborates with the Executive Director, and the Bureau Director of Policy and Programs to discuss possible changes based on the data such as assessment scores, ways to scale-up, or a need to modify existing activities. A task force meeting is then scheduled to bring forth what the OSE wants to implement.

Internal Approval Process

OSE has an External and Internal SSIP Task Force. The members include current and former special education directors, parents of current and former students with disabilities. These groups play a part in the agreement or consensus of each of the components outlined above. The Executive Director must sign off on any revisions before the next submission.

Response to OSEP-Required Actions



OSEP releases required actions within the finalized SPP/APR along with the OSEP determinations. Indicate who reviews the required actions and how assigned SEA staff make the plan to address concerns and create a response.

The OSE Executive Director, Director of the Bureau of Data and Compliance, Bureau Director of Policy and Programs, and the SSIP Literacy Coordinator review the required actions and work together to plan to address it.

Online SPP/APR Submission Tool Information

Describe login information, including

1. who has access
2. the type of access (e.g., read only, super user)
3. how to gain access for additional staff
4. how to access online SPP/APR submission tool support

If there are multiple parties responsible for or involved in the process, list them all.

OSE, Bureau Director of Data and Compliance

Submission

Indicator 17 data is provided by the SSIP Literacy Coordinator. The coordinator compiles the SPP/APR data from the office of OTSS. It's then reviewed by the Bureau Director of Policy and Program Supports and the Director of Student Outcomes and provided to the Bureau Director of Data and Compliance, OSE. The Executive Director is the person to certify the final report.

Clarification

The Bureau Director of Data and Compliance, OSE provides MDE staff with OSEP's requests for clarification. The SSIP Literacy Coordinator would prepare the response for Indicator 17 and the Bureau Director of Policy and Program Supports, and the Executive Director would review and approve for submission.

Public Reporting

The SEA posts the state's SPP/APR, SSIP Theory of Action, Evaluation, and Indicator 17 on the OSE page on the MDE website. The SSIP Support Specialist provides the Bureau Director of Policy and Program Supports with the information to have it posted. This website is public and accessible to all.