

and school leaders in developing and sustaining strong LEAs and schools. Missouri’s children deserve high-quality educational opportunities that will prepare them for a successful future.

A. Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)

Understanding that the purpose of Title I, Part A of the Every Student Succeeds Act is to ensure that all students have a significant opportunity to have a fair and equitable, high-quality education and to close educational achievement gaps, MO-DESE provides the following information relative to this title. First, Missouri has had academic and performance standards since 1986. Core-content academic standards underwent revision from 2014 through 2015, prior to the directive in ESSA. School improvement standards are currently under revision as a part of the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) update. Second, new assessments aligned to the recently adopted standards will be implemented on a phased-in basis beginning with the 2017-18 school year. While MSIP is often seen primarily as a tool for district accreditation, the ancillary reports provide summary analysis of achievement data for all students, subgroups and the super-subgroups for LEAs and schools. These reports can and do drive improvement for all students, helping to close educational achievement gaps. These two actions and the process of annual review under MSIP are closely aligned to the purposes of Title I, Part A.

1. Challenging State Academic Standards and Assessments (*ESEA section 1111(b)(1) and (2) and 34 CFR §§ 200.1–200.8.*)⁴
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

⁴ 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.

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

- 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.

MO-DESE will continue its implementation of its “right test, right time” administration of End-of-Course (EOC) assessments, particularly in the area of mathematics.

MO-DESE’s plan encourages LEAs to offer students access to courses that prepare them for college and a career, and similarly to offer elementary students access to courses that prepare them for high school. For many students, an accelerated course pattern is optimal because it keeps them engaged in rigorous content. Further, this approach provides subsequent flexibility in high school schedules for advanced mathematics and/or advanced career and technical opportunities. It is imperative that students be provided the opportunity to move into the advanced content once individual readiness has been established.

MO-DESE will continue the process outlined in the approved NCLB Flexibility Waiver Request (June 2015). The following will be used for accountability purposes:

- Proficient Algebra I in middle school + Algebra II in high school
- Proficient Algebra I and Geometry in middle school + Algebra II in high school
- Proficient Algebra I, Geometry and Algebra II in middle school + plan from LEA

For accountability purposes, LEAs and schools will need to determine which assessment, the Grade Level Assessment (GLA) or EOC, is the most appropriate measure for each individual student. When a student fails to score proficient or better on Algebra I prior to ninth grade, the student may be reassessed on the same or a higher mathematics examination in high school for school accountability purposes.

Students are able to participate in the assessment that is most appropriate to the content they have successfully completed at the middle school/junior high level. For example, students who take the Algebra I EOC in grade 7 and subsequently

complete either Geometry or Algebra II content participate in the appropriate EOC, rather than the GLA.

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.
MO-DESE defines “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population” as five percent of the statewide tested population. MO-DESE’s definition of tested population is the unduplicated count of students who participated in a given content assessment in the prior year. The numerator is defined as the number of students LEAs report as having a specific non-English language code in the statewide data system. Missouri’s greatest reported language other than English, while below this threshold, is Spanish. This constitutes 2.41 percent of the tested population in ELA and 2.45 percent of the population in mathematics. All other reported languages are below .25 percent of the tested population.
- ii. Identify any existing assessments in languages other than English, and specify for which grades and content areas those assessments are available.
MO-DESE does not have any existing academic 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.
MO-DESE’s definition of “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population” indicates that Missouri is not currently in need of an assessment in other languages.
- 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.
 - a. If a specific language other than English reaches the five percent threshold, MO-DESE will make every effort to develop and administer required assessments in a reasonable timeframe. In the event the threshold is reached, MO-DESE will include such languages in the Request for Proposal (RFP) as part of the assessment procurement

process. MO-DESE will require its assessment vendors to incorporate and document industry-accepted best practices and federal peer-review requirements. Based on Missouri's statutory requirements for and recent experience with assessment development, a reasonable timeline for this process is three academic years from the issuance of the RFP to implementation.

b. MO-DESE gathered input on assessments in languages other than English as a part of the ESSA assessment work group process subsequent to the statewide meetings in the fall of 2016. Seventy-five stakeholders participated in four work group meetings in November and December regarding standards and assessments.

In addition, MO-DESE's Director of Migrant and English Language Learner Programs and the Director of English language curriculum conducted three additional regional meetings, two in the fall of 2016 and one in February of 2017, to gain feedback related to the need for assessments in languages other than English.

c. Not applicable at this time.

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). MO-DESE will continue to use the following subgroups in the state's accountability system: Black (not Hispanic), Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, American Indian/Alaska Native, White (not Hispanic), and Multi-Racial. MO-DESE will report on other groups including Homeless, Foster, Military Dependent, and Gifted. However, these groups will not be included in accountability determinations.
- 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.
MO-DESE does not include any additional subgroups of students other than those statutorily required subgroups in the statewide accountability system.
- 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.
- [Click here to enter text.](#)

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.
- MO-DESE has determined that 30 is the minimum number of students necessary to be included to carry out the requirements of any provision under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that require disaggregation of information by each subgroup of students for accountability purposes.
- b. Describe how the minimum number of students is statistically sound.
- MO-DESE uses 30 as the minimum number of students in a subgroup for accountability. Standard reference tables of statistics use 30 as the minimum large group size. This is consistent with Title I regulations issued on April 9, 2007.
- 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.
- MO-DESE convened an accountability work group specifically to address accountability measures required by ESSA. The work group discussed the topic of the minimum number of students. The consensus of the group was that 30 is the advisable for decision making and accountability.
- d. Describe how the State ensures that the minimum number is sufficient to not reveal any personally identifiable information.⁵
- MO-DESE's rules around protection of personally identifiable information are based on the best practices of the National Center for

⁵ Consistent with ESEA section 1111(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.

Educational Statistics Data Quality Campaign. Statistical analysis will exclude populations of less than 30.

- B. 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.

MO-DESE's minimum number of students for reporting purposes is 10. MO-DESE's data suppression policy was informed by the best practices of the National Center for Educational Statistics Data Quality Campaign.

- i. 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.

Missouri, and Missouri's stakeholders, seeks to be competitive nationally as evidenced by input received during MO-DESE's regional meetings of 2016. MO-DESE believes that one of the most important ways to achieve that outcome is to address the rate at which students fail to achieve success, both in graduation and achievement. Said another way, MO-DESE believes that our students will be successful and competitive if we address their learning rather than simply the competitive standing of the state.

MO-DESE's first strategic goal is for all students to graduate from high school ready for college, career, and life. MO-DESE currently measures progress toward this goal by examining achievement and improvement on several standards, with data aggregated at the school and LEA levels. MO-DESE's work is guided by a strategic plan that includes targets for academic achievement and graduation rates, as well as other metrics. The graduation-rate targets aim to reduce by half the rate at which students fail to graduate in the next ten years. Academic achievement targets are similar in intent. MO-DESE has set the goal to reduce by half the rate at which students fail to achieve proficiency over the next 10 years.

These targets and measures of yearly improvement are expressed in the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) Performance Index (MPI). The MPI is a measure of achievement that examines four discrete levels of achievement, including proficiency. An explanation of the calculation of MPI is contained in appendix B. The relationship between MPI and proficiency rates is approximate, rather than exact. However, a one-percent change in proficiency rates will produce a one-point change in the MPI. MO-DESE emphasizes the use of MPIs for goal setting and

school evaluation because it continues to value improvement at all levels. Consequently, the goals are expressed primarily in terms of current and future MPI targets. For the sake of stakeholders that find proficiency rates more desirable, those goals are also translated to proficiency rates.

Missouri's state assessments continue to be evaluated as rigorous when mapped against the National Assessment of Educational Progress. However, MO-DESE and the stakeholders of Missouri are not satisfied that current performance indicates that all students are prepared to be competitive in their futures. We believe that cutting the rate at which all students fail to achieve proficiency, as measured by MPI scores, is a critical issue for each student and for all of Missouri. Based on 2016 achievement data, Missouri would expect 81.5 percent of students to be proficient (MPI of 367.5) in English language arts and 74.3 percent of students to be proficient in mathematics (MPI of 360.9) by 2026. While these goals are for all students, each subgroup of students has a goal set in the same manner. The goals, expressed both in MPI and proficiency rates are available in appendix A as a part of the measures of interim progress.

MO-DESE notes that once the implementation of new assessments has been fully realized, these goals may require recalculation. The ultimate aim of reducing failure to achieve is not negotiable, but proficiency rates on the new assessment may not be comparable to the current ones.

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.

While MO-DESE values the MPI for the measurement of student achievement at the school and LEA level, a discussion based on that metric may become excessively technical. For the sake of simplicity, this discussion will be based on proficiency rates. This view, while admittedly reductionist, is more accessible for conceptualizing. As noted earlier, the relationship is not lockstep between MPI, which includes four levels of achievement, and proficiency rates. However, a one-percent change in proficiency does equate to a one-point change in MPI. With that in mind, the long-term goals for academic achievement in Missouri are to reduce the percentage of students not scoring proficient or advanced in ELA and mathematics by half in the next 10 years. These goals are for all students and for each subgroup of students. By taking this approach, subgroups with an average score less than that of the whole group will necessarily have a

rate of improvement (reduction of percentage less than proficient) greater than the whole group. The exception is for students with disabilities. ESSA requires coordination with other laws, including the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The goals for this group are consistent with the goals found in Missouri's IDEA state implementation plan.

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.

MO-DESE's first goal in its strategic plan is that all students graduate ready for college, career and life. This goal embodies the belief that all students should graduate from high school. While readiness is addressed in MO-DESE's goals for academic achievement and college-and-career readiness, graduation rate expectations are made explicit in the metrics associated with the graduation rate goals.

The ambitious long-term goals and interim progress measures for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate were established in a manner similar to the method for establishing academic achievement goals. MO-DESE has set the goal of reducing the rate of failure to graduate by half over the next 10 years. This translates into an annual improvement rate of one-half of one percentage point per year for all students. Again, parallel to the academic achievement goals, the goals for each subgroup of students is to cut the rate of failure to graduate in half over the next 10 years. The exception, noted above, is for students with disabilities. The goal for this group is taken from the approved state plan for IDEA.

2. If applicable, describe the long-term goals for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, including (i) baseline data; (ii) 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; (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious; and (iv) how the long-term goals are more rigorous than the long-term goal set for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.

Not applicable.

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.

MO-DESE used a similar approach to the one used for goal setting for academic achievement in setting the long-term goals and measures of interim progress for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. The goal is to reduce the percentage of students failing to graduate in four years by half in the next 10 years. The goals are set similarly for each subgroup so that gaps will close because of differential rates of improvement. Similarly to the academic achievement goals, the goals for students with disabilities are taken from the state implementation plan for IDEA, per the requirement of coordination with other laws, including IDEA, found in ESSA.

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.

MO-DESE has developed student-level targets, the basis for long-term goals and measures of interim progress, by reviewing research and analyzing data. The following steps were taken to establish these targets. First, a standard measure of academic English proficiency (AEP) was established. For the sake of clarity, AEP does not connote proficiency on the English language arts assessment. AEP indicates that a student is proficient in English at a level that allows them to properly use and process academic language. This is distinct from being proficient in English at an everyday functional level. Next, research was reviewed to determine rigorous yet realistic timelines for attaining AEP. Finally, data was analyzed to examine whether the research conclusions could be applied to Missouri ELs in a manner that ensured annual progress for all.

MO-DESE established that a composite score of 4.7 on the WIDA ACCESS 2.0[®] assessment constitutes AEP. This was determined through examining data analysis performed by the WIDA Consortium. MO-DESE supplied MAP data for both ELs and English-only students to WIDA. WIDA then created a box plot analysis that allowed the comparison of MAP scale scores across subsets of students. English only students were compared to ELs with outcomes aggregated by ACCESS 2.0[®] bracket (1=1.0 to 1.9, etc.). MAP data included both ELA and

mathematics scale scores. Box plots are included in appendix C. The box plots illustrate that ELs scoring just below the 5th level bracket (5.0-5.9), have MAP outcomes that are congruent with English only students scoring proficient. More specifically, the top three quartiles of ELs scoring in this bracket were proficient. The exceptions to these analyses were at third grade where an ACCESS 2.0[®] bracket score of 4.0 was congruent to English only students and in eighth grade mathematics where 5.0 ELs far outperformed English-only students. The later data were skewed because eighth grade Algebra I scores were not present in the data.

To determine how quickly ELs could be expected to become AEP, MO-DESE reviewed research performed by the WIDA Consortium and the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL). While WIDA bases its research on student outcomes from consortium members, CAL examines the same data on a nationwide scale. MO-DESE compared outcomes for Missouri students to the CAL data. The primary conclusion was that Missouri students perform very similarly to those in the national datasets. For an EL to become AEP, research indicates that ELs become AEP orally more quickly than they do in written form. MO-DESE does not discount the former modality but has determined to use the written form due to schools' reliance on abilities in writing. According to Hakuta, Butler and Witt (2000)⁶, even under the best of circumstances, AEP can be attained in four to seven years. MO-DESE has determined that student targets built on a six-year expectation, and further divided to consider length of time in an English language instructional program, provide both equity and rigor as a basis for expectations.

MO-DESE determines a starting proficiency level at the time of the first English language proficiency assessment, which is administered within five months of the student's initial identification. MO-DESE also takes into consideration grade level and time in an English language acquisition program. It is important to understand that while many other factors affect the rate at which learners attain AEP, they do not lend themselves to accurate or consistent data collection. Therefore, research tends to present its conclusions in ranges rather than precise timeframes. The students who have received less than four years of English language instruction have different targets for AEP than those receiving four or more years. To be specific, the probability of becoming academically English proficient is less for students receiving less than four years of instruction than it is for those receiving four or more years of instruction. As a

⁶ Hakuta, K., Butler, Y.G., Witt, D. (2000) How Long Does it Take English Learners to Attain Proficiency? The University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute, Policy Report 2000-1.

reminder, AEP indicates that a student is functional in English using academic language, not that they are proficient on the ELA assessment.

With a metric for AEP established, MO-DESE determined that it would use two mechanisms to ensure that all students made progress in acquiring the English language. First, the long-term goals and measures of interim progress in appendix a establish increasing expectations for the entire population. Second, MO-DESE proposes an accountability structure that rewards LEAs for the progress each student makes.

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.

ii. 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.

Indicator	Measure(s)	Description
Academic Achievement	Combined ELA and mathematics MAP Performance Index (MAP MPI)	<p>The academic indicator for Title I accountability will consist of the three-year average MPIs for ELA and mathematics. These average MPIs are combined and the scale for this average ranges from 100 to 500.</p> <p>As previously mentioned, MO-DESE uses the MPI to evaluate outcomes on statewide assessments. The MPI takes into account the achievement of students at four discrete achievement levels, including proficiency. An explanation of the MPI calculation is found in appendix B.</p> <p>Missouri’s long-term goals and measures of interim progress are expressed primarily in MPI, with proficiency rates provided for simplicity. The use of the MPI in ELA and math allows the MO-DESE to evaluate a school’s performance</p>

Indicator	Measure(s)	Description
		<p>and improvement over time as well as its distance from the state's goals.</p> <p>MO-DESE collects data in sufficient detail to calculate MPI for all students and for each subgroup of students.</p>

- 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.

Indicator	Measure(s)	Description
Academic Progress	For elementary and middle schools, MO-DESE uses the Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) derived from the growth calculation associated with MAP Grade Level assessments in ELA and mathematics.	<p>MO-DESE's growth calculation is a Valued Added Model (VAM) that compares individual student results to predictions based on statewide results in ELA and mathematics. MO-DESE will use a combined 3-year NCE average from each content area.</p> <p>Technical information on the calculation of the growth model and intermediate NCE results are contained in appendix D. MO-DESE will rank the summed NCEs.</p> <p>Per the explanation in iv. a. above, these assessments are given annually and NCEs are calculated annually as well. Results can be disaggregated for all subgroups required by ESSA.</p>

- 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).

Indicator	Measure(s)	Description
Graduation Rate	Four-year graduation rate	<p>MO-DESE’s strategic plan and dashboard includes a long-term goal for graduation rates statewide. Because student demographics are included in the annual cycle of data collection, results can be disaggregated by subgroup.</p> <p>MO-DESE will average the most recent three years of graduation rates.</p> <p>Missouri does not have a state-defined alternate diploma. Section (v) of question c. is not applicable in Missouri.</p>

- 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.

Indicator	Measure(s)	Description
Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency	MO-DESE will employ an English Acquisition Index (EAI) that credits schools for participation rates in WIDA ACCESS 2.0 [®] , the percentage of students attaining AEP, and growth on WIDA ACCESS 2.0 [®] .	<p>MO-DESE has developed an index score that provides an incentive for schools to identify and address the needs of English learners by including three factors in the index. Technical information on the calculation of this index is found in appendix C. The total scale of this indicator ranges from 0 -20.</p> <p>The first factor credits schools for the participation rate of ELs in WIDA ACCESS 2.0[®]. This factor is given up to 3 points.</p> <p>The second factor credits schools for the percentage of students achieving AEP. This factor is given up to 5 points.</p> <p>The final factor credits schools for the growth shown by each EL on WIDA ACCESS 2.0[®] as shown in appendix A. This factor is given up to 12 points.</p>

- 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.

Indicator	Measure(s)	Description
i. School Quality or Student Success	The percentage of students attending school 90% of the time.	Three years of data will be averaged to determine the percent of students attending school at least 90% of the time. An NCE will be calculated and will be ranked.

- iii. 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.
- MO-DESE will calculate an index score based on all the indicators of the accountability system. The index will be calculated for each school receiving Title I, Part A funds. The index will also be calculated for each subgroup of 30 or greater present in each of those schools. Because the scale of each indicator is of a significantly different magnitude and range, MO-DESE will calculate and assign an NCE for each indicator that does not already have one. This will normalize the scales so that weighting of indicators is proportional.
1. Academic Achievement – MO-DESE will average the MPIs for ELA and mathematics and rank the resulting average MPI. An NCE will be calculated based on this rank and assigned to each school. The calculated NCE will be multiplied by four.
 2. Student Progress – MO-DESE will average the NCEs for ELA and mathematics derived in the growth model calculation. The resulting average NCE will be ranked and the rank will be multiplied by three.
 3. Graduation Rate – MO-DESE will rank the three-year average graduation rates and calculate NCEs. The NCE will be multiplied by three.
 4. English language acquisition – MO-DESE will assign three points for participation in WIDA ACCESS 2.0[®], five points for meeting the rate of students becoming AEP, and 12 points for gains on the WIDA ACCESS 2.0[®]. These total points will be ranked and NCEs calculated. The NCE will be multiplied by two.
 5. Student Success/School Quality – MO-DESE will measure attendance, defined as the percentage of students attending at least

90 percent of the time. Attendance rates will be ranked and NCEs calculated. The NCE will be multiplied by one.

The resulting calculations will be summed to arrive at an index score. Schools will be ranked on their respective index scores and the lowest five percent of schools receiving Title I funds. The highest index score of the lowest five percent of schools will establish the Identification Threshold for that year.

In addition to identifying the lowest-performing five percent of schools receiving Title I, Part A funds, MO-DESE will identify any high school that fails to graduate at least two-thirds of its seniors for Comprehensive Support and Improvement.

In cases where ELs are not present or present in numbers below which calculation is not possible, the remaining standards will be weighted by redistributing the points associated with that indicator. Academic Progress and Graduation Rate will be multiplied by 3.75, and Chronic Absenteeism by 1.25.

In order to identify schools with low performing subgroups, each subgroup identified in 1111(c)(2), including students who are economically disadvantaged, students from major racial and ethnic groups, children with disabilities and ELs will then be treated as if they were their own building and examined using the same accountability structure. These subgroup calculations will be subject to n size restrictions and will be pooled if necessary. Those schools with subgroups whose index score is at or below the intervention threshold (lowest five percent) will be identified for Targeted Support and Improvement.

- 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 indicators will be weighted as follows:

Indicator	EL present	EL fewer than 30 (minimum n)
Academic Achievement	4	5
English language arts (2)		
Mathematics (2)		
Academic Progress / Grad. Rate	3	3.75
English Language Acquisition	2	-
Progress to Proficiency (1.2)		
Growth (.5)		
Participation (.3)		
Attendance	1	1.25
Total Summative Rating	10	10

- 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 or methodologies, indicating the type(s) of schools to which it applies.
- iv. Identification of Schools (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D))
- 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, including the year in which the state will first identify schools.
- MO-DESE’s methodology for identifying schools for Comprehensive Support and Improvement will result in the identification of schools that are
1. among the lowest five percent of schools receiving Title I funds, based on the indicators outlined above;
 2. high schools with an average four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate less than 67 percent over a period of three years; or
 3. schools that fail to meet the exit criteria as a school identified for Targeted Support and Intervention that have chronically low-performing subgroups.
- The method for annual meaningful differentiation above will result in scores for every receiving Title I school in the state. MO-DESE will rank the schools by these scores and identify the lowest-performing (highest-scoring) five percent of schools from the ranking. There will be approximately 62 schools identified under this method. The schools will be identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement. MO-DESE estimates that approximately six high schools will be identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement because of low graduation rate.
- 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, including the year in which the state will first identify schools.

Any public high school that fails to graduate one third or more of its students for three years will be identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement.

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, including the year in which the state will first identify schools.

If schools receiving Title I, Part A funds are identified for targeted support and improvement and receive additional targeted support yet fail to meet the state’s exit criteria in three years, then those schools will be identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement.

- a. Frequency of Identification. Provide, for each type of schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement 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.

Timeline for Identification of Schools for Comprehensive Support and Improvement	
	Activities
2016-17	Continue to provide services to schools identified as Priority and Focus schools under ESEA Flexibility Waiver
2017-18	Continue to provide services to schools identified as Priority and Focus schools under ESEA Flexibility Waiver
Spring 2018	Administer new ELA and mathematics assessments based on Missouri Learning Standards (MLS)
Fall 2018	Identify schools for Comprehensive Support and Improvement based on criteria outlined above
Fall 2021	Identify schools for Comprehensive Support and Improvement based on criteria outlined above and schools that were previously classified for Targeted Support and Improvement, who have failed to exit status for three consecutive years, as chronically underperforming

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))

In accordance with federal law, schools in which a subgroup’s performance is congruent with schools identified for Comprehensive

Support and Improvement for two consecutive years will be identified as having one or more consistently underperforming subgroups.

- b. 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)*)

Again, in accordance with federal law, beginning in 2018, any school that has one or more subgroups of students which, on its own, would lead to identification for Comprehensive Support and Improvement will be identified for additional Targeted Support. Schools will be identified every two years.

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

MO-DESE will include one additional statewide category of schools. This category of schools will be comprised of schools that would otherwise be included in Comprehensive Support and Intervention that administer no assessments (MAP grade level assessments or WIDA ACCESS 2.0[®]) and have only a single indicator of school quality or success. In this example, schools will have only attendance data available to make a determination about identification. If a school that administers no assessments has a chronic absenteeism rate consistent with the schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, MO-DESE will assign an ASI to further analyze the school before identification. At a minimum, analysis will be based on a site visit and analysis of students’ academic outcomes in subsequent grade levels. Following analysis, the school will be identified for improvement if advisable.

- v. 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.

Participation on state assessments will remain a primary component of MO-DESE’s accountability system. All LEAs, schools and subgroups will be required to assess at least 95 percent of their students on assessments required by the MAP.

Any school with less than a 95 percent participation rate in ELA or mathematics will automatically fail to earn points for academic achievement in the state’s system for meaningfully differentiating schools. MO-DESE will utilize the same criteria for any subgroup(s), including students with disabilities and ELs, for which the rate falls below 95 percent.

- vi. 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.
MO-DESE's uniform statewide exit criteria for a school identified for comprehensive support and improvement will require identified schools to score above the original Improvement Threshold at least two of the most recent three years.
- 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.
MO-DESE's uniform statewide exit criteria for a school identified for targeted support and improvement will require that the identified subgroup(s) improve at a rate congruent with the rate for that subgroup outlined in the state's measures of interim progress for at least two of the most recent three years. For example, if a school is identified for improvement because students with disabilities, when treated as if they constituted a building, performed congruent with schools identified for CSI, and if the same subgroup of students achieved a rate of improvement of two MPI per year for two of three years, the school would meet the exit criteria. The yearly two MPI improvement goal for this subgroup and all subgroups is set out in appendix A.
- 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.
At initial identification, Comprehensive Support and Improvement schools will have conducted a needs assessment based on accountability and any other relevant data. As a part of the initial improvement process, the LEA will have selected evidence-based interventions related to the areas of focus identified by the needs assessment. Additionally, MO-DESE will have required participation in professional development associated with high-effect size teaching and instructional practices. MO-DESE Area Supervisors of Instruction (ASIs) will have met monthly to monitor accountability plan implementation through the existing Regional School Improvement Team (RSIT) process.

Schools that have not met the exit criteria after year three or have not shown improvement as determined by MO-DESE, will first undergo an analysis of why the original interventions did not produce the desired results. The analysis will be conducted in partnership with MO-DESE

staff. This analysis will inform a new comprehensive needs assessment. MO-DESE may require that this needs assessment be conducted in partnership with or wholly by an entity outside the LEA with expertise in school improvement. The level of evidence for the selected interventions will necessarily be more rigorous than those originally selected. MO-DESE will engage school improvement specialists, to meet on a monthly basis with the schools requiring more rigorous interventions. These specialists will provide principal coaching and will closely monitor the fidelity of intervention implementation using 30-, 60-, and 90-day action plans.

- 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. Beginning in 2019, MO-DESE will review the Annual Secretary of the Board Report (ASBR) each year to determine that resource inequities do not exist at the building level in LEAs with buildings identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement.

MO-DESE will report resource allocations at the LEA and building level on the appropriate Annual Report Card.

- 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.

Fair, flexible and focused accountability and support systems are critical to continuously improving the academic achievement of all students, closing persistent achievement gaps and improving equity. Missouri's Statewide System of Support (SSOS) is the primary mechanism employed by MO-DESE to hold LEAs and schools accountable for achievement and to provide accountability and differentiated support to all LEAs. It is also through the SSOS that schools receive targeted technical assistance in developing and implementing accountability plans. This system includes evidence-based interventions that support improved student achievement, graduation rates and closing achievement gaps for all subgroups. It allows for MO-DESE to focus its efforts on schools identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement, while also providing a standard level of support and accountability to all LEAs and schools.

To ensure that LEAs and/or schools are implementing the requirements for schools identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement, the SSOS will provide ongoing support for and monitoring of the implementation of the activities identified above. The SSOS will conduct site visits to

- promote and develop the school's responsiveness to internal accountability;

- monitor and document indicators of progress pertinent to the district and/or building plans;
- gather data specific to the school;
- identify promising practices; and
- provide specific and timely feedback to the principal and other LEA staff.

The SSOS will assist in the development of a timeline for improvement and the planning of high-quality, evidence-based professional development focused on strategic instructional strategies that will result in increased language proficiency and improved academic results for ELs and students with disabilities.

MO-DESE is dedicated to focusing resources on ensuring an excellent educational system is accessible to all Missouri students. This means holding each LEA and school accountable for student outcomes along the students’ journey in preparation for post-secondary success. If a school is not demonstrating the expected outcomes for students, MO-DESE will intervene on behalf of the students with rapid and targeted interventions. The intervention system includes tools and strategies to build capacity at the LEA level to improve both schools and the entire system. There are four fundamental principles underlying Missouri’s SSOS.:

1. Students cannot wait for incremental improvement in their educational conditions.
2. The process of targeted intervention requires a systematic evaluative focus on implementation, dedicated project management and instructional improvement support.
3. Monitoring progress in LEAs and schools must be based on outcomes.
4. Collaboration between and among stakeholders is essential for sustainable improved student learning.

MO-DESE will provide dedicated supports specifically to those schools that have been identified for comprehensive support and improvement. Schools identified for Targeted Support and Improvement will have access to the same tools. However, personnel support will be limited by resources. Those schools will participate in a similar process with their Regional School Improvement Team (RSIT):

Step	Action
Pre-Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Activities begin to relay expectations of contracted staff that will be working with the identified school to implement the accountability plan.
School Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ School/LEA staff implements a 30-day planning process. This process is used by the principal and contracted staff to give special attention to the opening of the school year. Principals must identify key early wins and clarify adult and student behaviors that are in need of improvement.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contracted staff/RSIT leader, LEA and building level leaders meet every other month to discuss school climate and culture and, implementation of the accountability plan, and to review specific data that is pertinent to plan implementation. These meetings focus on the use of data to show evidence of implementation and the impact on critical indicators of improvement. ▪ School leader is assisted in the use of perceptual data that is collected and the setting of short- and long-term goals. ▪ Regional staff provides on-site coaching for building principals and other members of the school's leadership team.
Effective Instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Site visits are conducted by contracted staff with knowledge of the region. Site visits include classroom observations which provide feedback to the leadership team on the following: student learning objectives, complexity of the instruction, engagement of teachers and students, content, classroom management and assessment, and instruction practices. ▪ School leaders are debriefed to discuss and review observations. Written and verbal feedback is provided. ▪ Contracted staff work with school leaders to use the data generated by their own classroom walkthroughs and observations to map the effectiveness of their staff.
Teacher/Leader Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Schools utilize the Missouri teacher/leader standards and evaluation protocols that align with the Seven Principles of Effective Evaluation. ▪ School Leaders use mapping procedures to analyze the abilities and effectiveness of each staff member. The school leader and leadership team use this tool to assess the strengths and weaknesses in order to determine the intensity of support necessary to improve instructional practice and make informed personnel decisions.
Data Teams (utilization)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Monthly progress reports (running record) are used to capture the work that is being done to address the improvement targets in the accountability plan. These reports are used in the monthly meeting. ▪ Data dashboards are used to display critical data and include school-specific indicators, behaviors and practices.
Climate/Culture/Collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contracted staff/RSIT, LEA and school leadership conduct an on-site visit prior to plan implementation to review climate and

	<p>culture.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ School leader must create a culture of high expectations for students and adults. ▪ School leaders with assistance of contracted staff/RSIT and LEA staff redesign instructional time to allow collaborative teaming opportunities.
Statewide Professional Development Opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A summit is held to focus on critical needs of all identified schools (i.e. literacy).

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.

2. Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators (*ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B)*): Describe how low-income and minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, and the measures the SEA agency will use to evaluate and publicly report the progress of the State educational agency with respect to such description.⁷

Missouri recognizes that inequities exist in students' access to great teachers and school leaders across the United States. Students of color, students from low-income families, rural students, students with disabilities, students with limited English proficiency, and students who struggle academically are less likely than their peers to have such access. The causes of these inequities vary from place to place and context to context, with numerous policy, practice, economic and socio-cultural factors at play. Because of the multiple causes for inequity in teacher and leader distribution, the solutions must be systemic rather than treating merely the symptoms.

Monitoring ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers occurs through submission of data by LEAs through the MOSIS/Core Data System. MO-DESE defines an inexperienced teacher as a first year teacher. An out-of-field teacher is someone who is considered inappropriately certified by virtue of teaching a subject that does not correspond to one or more of the teacher's active certifications. An out-of-field teacher is one of a category of less-than-fully qualified teachers who meet one of the following criteria

- Is teaching on a provisional certificate
- Is teaching on a temporary authorization certificate
- Is lacking the necessary credential to be considered appropriately certified for at least one teaching assignment

⁷ Consistent with ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B), this description should not be construed as requiring a State to develop or implement a teacher, principal or other school leader evaluation system.

MO-DESE provides a model Educator Evaluation System for LEA and school use. Using MO-DESE's model, a teacher cannot be considered effective if any one of the following three criteria exist (see page 3 of the Summative Evaluation Form, Appendix F):

1. there is a significant area of concern initiating an improvement protocol, or
2. there is less than expected performance by the teacher, as determined by years in the current position, on quality indicators selected by the LEA or school, or
3. student growth targets have not been fully met.

LEAs that elect not to use the MO-DESE's model Educator Evaluation System must align their local process to the Essential Principles of Effective Evaluation. There are seven principles

1. Performance of educators measured against research-based, proven expectations and performance targets consistent with the improvement of student achievement.
2. Multiple ratings used to differentiate levels of educator performance.
3. A probationary period of adequate duration provided to ensure sufficient induction and socialization through developmental support for new teachers and leaders.
4. Measures of growth in student learning across two points in time included as a significant contributing factor in the evaluation of professional teacher and leader practice at all levels.
5. Ongoing, timely, deliberate and meaningful feedback provided on teacher and leader performance relative to research-based targets.
6. Standardized, periodic training provided for evaluators to ensure reliability and accuracy.
7. Evaluation results and data used to inform decisions regarding personnel, employment determinations and human resource policies such as promotion, retention, dismissal, tenure, compensation, etc.

At the conclusion of each academic year, LEAs submit building-level data on the alignment of their local evaluation process to the Essential Principles of Effective Evaluation. They must also identify the number of performance levels in their local evaluation process and the aggregate number of teachers rated in each of these levels.

Using the Missouri Leadership Development System and the Equity Lab Process, both described in the Title II section of this plan, MO-DESE will provide direction, guidance, and support to LEAs in using their evaluation data, particularly the number and placement of teachers rated in lower performance levels, to ensure that students in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective teachers. MO-DESE will focus particularly on those identified schools as determined through its Equity Plan Data Chart (See Appendix G). Public reporting of the current and changing measures included in this data chart happens through MO-DESE's Educator Equity webpage (<https://dese.mo.gov/educator-quality/equitable-access-excellent-education>).

MO-DESE will annually review the schools identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement and additional targeted support with regard to disproportionate assignment of low-income and minority children to ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced

teachers. Those buildings will be compared to other buildings in the LEA to ensure that no more than a 10 percent variance is present in these assignments. MO-DESE's longitudinal data system provides sufficient data for these analyses. Buildings identified as having greater variance than allowed will be given notice and time to correct inequities. Report cards for all LEAs will include educator assignment statistics. Schools identified for Comprehensive Support and Intervention will be required to conduct a local Educator Equity Lab, described in Section D of this application.

3. School Conditions (*ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(C)*): Describe how the SEA agency will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A to improve school conditions for student learning, including through reducing: (i) incidences of bullying and harassment; (ii) the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom; and (iii) the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety. MO-DESE is developing a robust online content delivery system that will include professional development that addresses positive social and behavioral practices to support LEAs in improving school conditions. LEAs will be made aware of this content through the SSOS. When mature, this system will tie the MO-DESE's data collection systems such as Core Data, Consultant Logs, teacher/leader evaluation, system reviews and tiered monitoring with access for all district staff to online curricula materials, career/technical education supports, common formative assessments, educator evaluation tools, self- assessment tools, professional development focusing on leadership, effective teaching and learning practices including social/behavioral practices, etc. The Virtual Learning Platform, currently under development, is an online portal that will provide MO-DESE endorsed, evidenced-based training. The materials in the virtual platform are organized to provide maximum flexibility of access of all users, from totally self-directed to highly directed and structured. During the development period, MO-DESE will continue to provide professional development for LEAs in the Multi-tiered System of Support that includes Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports.
4. School Transitions (*ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(D)*): Describe how the State will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A in meeting the needs of students at all levels of schooling (particularly students in the middle grades and high school), including how the State will work with such LEAs to provide effective transitions of students to middle grades and high school to decrease the risk of students dropping out. MO-DESE's online content delivery system will include material from the Missouri Model Guidance Curriculum that will support LEAs in providing students with effective transitions to middle and high school grades. The Missouri Post-Secondary Success Project (MPSS) is a college-and-career competency framework educators may use to systematically embed these competencies into course content. These competencies are integral to both in-school and post-secondary success by supporting students to be career-equipped, lifelong learners who are socially and emotionally engaged. This training is available to any LEA free of charge in both face-to- face and electronic formats.