Office of Educational Supports (OES) Section 31a At-Risk Program

Program Review Companion Guide (PRCG)
School Year 2020-21

Indicator Set Implementation Levels Rubrics

GENERAL INFORMATION

This Section 31a At-Risk Program Review Companion Guide (PRCG) is provided to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) to assist them in completing the Section 31a At-Risk Program Monitoring Indicators (PMI) and preparing for an On-Site Review (OSR)/Desk Review.

This document is aligned with the Section 31a At-Risk PMI and includes **indicator level rubrics** that describe LEA-level implementation. Each rubric describes what the Section 31a intent and purposes look like across the implementation levels. When applying this tool in the completion of the PMI, a team approach is recommended and encouraged to generate the most accurate information.

The purposes of the rubrics include:

- Serving as an informational resource and reflection tool
- Measuring fidelity and level of implementation
- Assisting with planning for the OSR/Desk Review, creating action plans for any Change Required indicators, and/or improving upon the LEA Improvement Plan
- Assisting the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) with technical assistance to LEAs

Sample Layout:

Indicator: Explanation of Indicator and Related Section 31a Sub-Section

Contributions to the Desired Outcome

Defines the positive result from the detailed practices described in the Expected Use in Practice

Expected Use in Practice

Explains how the LEA implements/demonstrates expected to use and/or exemplary practices that produce desired student achievement results

Developmental Use in Practice

Explains how the LEA implements/demonstrates partial expected use and/or exemplary practices that are establishing growth toward desired student achievement results

Unacceptable Use in Practice

Explains how the LEA is not implementing/demonstrating expected use and/or exemplary practices. Growth toward desired student achievement results cannot be determined with existing practices

Example Evidence

Provides specific examples of evidence that can be uploaded and/or presented during an OSR/Desk Review

Ratings:

Consultants rate "Implementation" of applicable components at the close of the OSR. Technical assistance may occur prior to and after a scheduled OSR, but, due to time constraints, not during the OSR.

SELF-ASSESSMENT RATING GUIDELINES – Indicator Sets 1, 2, and 3
- E – Expected Use in Practice
- U/CR – Unacceptable Use in Practice/Change Required

SELF-ASSESSMENT RATING GUIDELINES – Indicator Set 4
- E – Expected Use in Practice
- D – Developmental Use in Practice/Possible Change Required
- U – Unacceptable Use in Practice/Change Required

DIRECTIONS FOR USE

Prior to the OSR: Preparing for the OSR Visit/Conduct Team-Based Reflection
1. Read each indicator set thoroughly for a deep understanding.
2. Using existing data and evidence, work through the rubric by highlighting the cells that describe the LEA's current implementation level.
   - Practices and programs funded with Section 31a are be identified within the LEA's Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) and District Improvement Plan (DIP)/School Improvement Plan (SIP).
3. After completing an indicator rubric, mark the appropriate level of implementation, and determine evidence supporting this rating.
4. Transfer the self-assessment rating to the Section 31a At-Risk PMI and describe/upload the evidence supporting this rating.
   - This step is completed in the Grant Electronic Monitoring System (GEMS) no later than three weeks prior to the OSR date.
5. MDE consultants will provide comments, summary, and findings during and following the OSR.

Following the OSR: Change Required/Creating an Action Plan
1. Identify the desired level of implementation using this companion guide.
2. Compare the gap between the desired level and current level.
3. Create a compliance plan with actions steps, stakeholders engaged in action steps, persons responsible, timelines, and evidence of completion; submit in GEMS.
4. Contact the OES Section 31a Lead Consultant for technical assistance as needed.
5. Following approval of the Compliance Plan by the Lead Consultant, the LEA can begin uploading evidence for the Change Required indicators in GEMS. Completion of the Compliance Plan and submission of all necessary evidence demonstrating the changes must take place no later than one year from the date of the OSR.

LEAs should also feel encouraged to utilize the Program Review Companion Guide as a reflective tool to support the LEA's Continuous Improvement Process (CIP).

Indicator Set 1 (1-3) – Intent and Purposes of the Law/At-risk Pupil Identification

The intent and purposes of Section 31a are to provide instructional and direct non-instructional support services for pupils to achieve regular school attendance, English language arts proficiency by the end of 3rd grade, mathematics proficiency by the end of 8th grade, and career and college readiness by the end of high school. The Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) is the primary structure for LEAs to achieve these targets as they plan, implement, and evaluate programming including the implementation of Section 1280f of the Revised School Code, MCL 380.1280f (Read by Grade Three Law).

---

1. The LEA engages in a continuous improvement process (CIP) that results in an increase in At-risk eligible students' academic achievement aligned to the purposes: English language arts proficiency by the end of third grade, math proficiency by the end of eighth grade, and career and college readiness by the end of high school [Sec. 31a (1), (19)]

Contributions to the Desired Outcome

Set Continuous Improvement Process protocols and activities are defined and implemented to assist in monitoring student achievement and trends for At-risk eligible students in comparison to their non-At-risk peers. The LEA ensures the identification of instructional changes and supports necessary to promote academic achievement for all students.

Expected Use in Practice

The LEA's At-risk programming demonstrates improvement in academic achievement for At-risk eligible students aligned to the purpose.

- **English language arts proficiency by the end of 3rd grade**
- **mathematics proficiency by the end of 8th grade**
- **career and college readiness (ELA, Math, and Science) by the end of high school**

AND generally, all of the following conditions are in place and contribute to growth within the LEA.

- The LEA's At-risk eligible student achievement scores are equal to, or greater than those students not identified as At-risk eligible or the LEA has significantly increased proficiency rates of other impacted groups over the previous three years.
- The LEA analyzes district/building/pupil assessment data specific to At-risk eligible students each marking period. This determines instructional/program needs resulting in increased achievement and closing opportunity gaps for special population groups.
- Teams meet regularly and use data-driven decision-making and problem-solving processes at the school, classroom, and individual student levels to make academic decisions, resulting in increased achievement and adjustments to intervention assignments accordingly for this other impacted groups.
- Teams discuss and consider the contributions to student performance and instructional efficacy that result from economically disadvantaged homes, socio-cultural diversity, and English learner status.
- Actions/Adjustments are noted in the DIP/SIP and monitored annually for effectiveness.
- Evaluation methods, such as the Program Evaluation Tool (PET), are utilized as a part of this process.

Unacceptable Use in Practice

The LEA's At-risk programming does not demonstrate improvement in academic achievement for At-risk eligible pupils

<u>AND/OR</u> less than three of the expected use in practice conditions are in place.

Example Evidence

Required: State assessment results including sub-groups (trend data for 3-5 years); Local assessment results including sub-groups (trend data for 3-5 years); Summary of Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA); District Improvement Plan (DIP)/School Improvement Plan (SIP); Program Evaluation Tool (PET) or other evaluation tool; CIP meeting agendas, sign-in, and minutes and action plans/goal-setting documentation.

Additional Example Evidence (LEA Specifies): District/School-wide Achievement Snapshot Template; LEA accountability reports (Index Score, Annual Education Report, etc.); LEA MTSS framework; data analysis meeting agendas, sign-ins and minutes; student support team meeting agendas, sign-ins and minutes; student improvement/educational development plan samples; demographic data; achievement data; fidelity check summaries; professional learning calendar, logs, and surveys.

2. The LEA establishes and implements effective attendance practices to achieve regular attendance for all students [Sec. 31a (1)]

Contributions to the Desired Outcome

Set attendance protocols and activities are defined and implemented to monitor and address absenteeism, communicate with parents/guardians, and provide tiered and proactive engagement strategies on the importance of regular attendance. Programming and support ensure regular attendance by all students.

Expected Use in Practice

Chronic absenteeism is not an issue for the LEA.

- The LEA's average daily attendance rate is 90% or higher for each building or 10% improvement from the previous school year is evident.
- The percentage of students with chronic absenteeism is less than 10% of the whole student body or
  at least 10% improvement from the previous school year is evident.

AND generally, all of the following conditions are in place, and contribute to achievement growth within the LEA.

- The LEA ensures policies, procedures, timelines, systems, and staff responsible for monitoring student attendance are in place and followed.
  - these are evaluated annually for fidelity and ensure positive outcomes
- The LEA consistently acts to identify and reverse attendance issues for pupils who are in jeopardy of not being promoted/graduating.
- Parents/guardians are regularly notified and engaged in ways to improve their child's attendance.
- The LEA ensures regular and consistent attendance is consistently recognized.

Unacceptable Use in Practice

Chronic absenteeism is an issue for the LEA, and less than a 10% improvement from the previous school year is evident.

- The LEA's average daily attendance rate is below 90% for each building.

  and/or

- The percentage of students with chronic absenteeism is greater than 10% of the whole student body, and the LEA has not demonstrated 10% improvement.

AND less than three of the above conditions are in place.

Example Evidence

Required: LEA attendance policy/procedure manual; documentation of monitoring attendance, actions, recognition, and parent/family engagement to improve attendance.

Additional Example Evidence (LEA Specifies): Impact of policy/procedures on attendance rates; attendance records; written job responsibilities; attendance toolkit.

3. The LEA correctly identifies and codes their At-risk eligible students as 3060 in the applicable Fall, Spring, and End-of-Year (EOY) Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) collections. [Sec. 31a(19)]

Contributions to the Desired Outcome

Set At-risk identification protocols and activities are defined and implemented to accurately identify At-risk eligible students to provide programming that supports their academic achievement. Ensure compliance with State and Federal reporting and accurate Section 31a allocation calculations.

Expected Use in Practice

The LEA has a set process and timeline for identifying and coding At-risk eligible students, and completing the MSDS collections in the Fall, Spring, and EOY.

Additionally, generally, all of the following conditions are in place within the LEA.

- key personnel are identified and have documentation to support accurate identification of students in the following categories
  - o a student failing to achieve proficiency on ELA, mathematics, science, or social studies on State summative assessments
  - o a student At-risk of not meeting LEA's core academic curricular objectives in ELA or mathematics as demonstrated on local assessments
  - o an English learner
  - o a student economically disadvantaged (includes Homeless, Migratory, and Foster Care)
  - o an immigrant who has immigrated within the immediately preceding 3 years
  - o a student in attendance that did not graduate High School in 4 years
  - o a chronically absent student
  - o a victim of child abuse or neglect
  - o a pregnant teenager or teenage parent
  - o a family history of school failure, incarceration, or substance abuse
- time is set aside for key personnel to accurately upload identifications into MSDS in all three general collections
- State assessment proficiencies and data provided through MTSS is considered in At-risk identification

Unacceptable Use in Practice

The LEA does not have a set process and timeline for identifying and coding At-risk eligible students accurately and completing the MSDS collections in the Fall, Spring, and EOY,

AND/OR less than two of the expected use conditions are in place.

Example Evidence

Required: At-risk LEA identification guidance document for Section 31a; LEA Section 31a Annual Program and Fiscal Report (APFR); Grade-Level Identification Criteria Worksheets for Section 31a Pupils; English Learner and Immigrant Identification Procedures; Homeless Identification Procedures.

Additional Example Evidence (LEA Specifies): Student registration and At-risk identification guidance manuals.

Indicator Set 2 (4-10) – Allowable Use of Funds - Instructional/Non-Instructional Services

Use of funds for the purposes outlined in Indicators 4-10 support the whole child resulting in greater ability to attend to academic learning. With the coordination and integration of programs and activities provided by schools, mental health agencies, security personnel, and nutrition services, LEAs are able to minimize the duplication of services.

4. The LEA utilizes funds only for instructional programs and direct non-instructional services such as medical, mental health, counseling services, primary health care services provided to children and adolescents up to age 21. No funds are utilized for administrative costs [Sec. 31a(5)]

Expected Use in Practice

The LEA utilizes all funds allocated within the State of Michigan fiscal year it was received for the intent and purposes of the law, no funds are used for administrative costs, <u>AND</u> generally, all of the following conditions are in place and contribute to growth within the LEA.

- Instructional and non-instructional services provide students access to well-trained professionals, caring adults, and support services that help facilitate and build upon existing school–family relationships.
- Non-instructional programs are guided by school personnel, school-employed mental health professionals, and school security staff.
- Process and procedures for accessing instructional and non-instructional services are communicated and understood by staff, families, and students.
- The needs assessment informs district leadership and drive the selection of student programming and supports services to meet the instructional and non-instructional needs of students.
- The Annual Program and Fiscal Report accurately report supports and services utilized by the LEA.
- The Section 31a carryover from year-to-year is less than 25% and completely utilized the following year.

Unacceptable Use in Practice

The LEA has utilized funding for administrative positions or expenditures not aligned with the intent and purpose of the law;
Section 31a carryover from year-to-year is more than 25% and/or not completely utilized the following year;
<u>AND/OR</u> less than four of the above conditions are in place.

Example Evidence

Required: Summary of CNA; DIP/SIP; Documentation/explanation of district instructional and non-instructional programs; Job descriptions with roles and responsibilities; Expenditure reports specific to Section 31a programs/services that note the activity, cost and FTE or other pertinent info (optional template available); Agendas, sign-in sheets, LEA process and procedure manuals for accessing services.

Additional Example Evidence (LEA Specifies): Staff rosters and credentials; organizational chart; budget outline and reports.

5. The LEA utilizes Section 31a funds to supplement the School Breakfast Program. [Sec. 31a (6)]

Expected Use in Practice

The LEA utilizes funds to support the School Breakfast Program or provides exemption documentation due to not implementing a School Breakfast Program.

Unacceptable Use in Practice

The LEA does not utilize at least $.01 per pupil for whom the LEA receives Section 31a funding to supplement the School Breakfast Program or does not provide exemption documentation.

Example Evidence

Required: LEA Section 31a Expenditure Report demonstrating use of funds for the School Breakfast Program, OR LEA School Board approval to not implement a School Breakfast Program.

Additional Example Evidence (LEA Specifies): Documentation of how the supplemental funds benefitted the School Breakfast Program.

6. The LEA may utilize funds for instructional and non-instructional services for school-wide reform that meets the following requirements.

> **more than 40% of pupils are identified as At-risk*
>
> **aligns to the intent and purposes of Section 31a*
>
> **funds are expended for Tier 1, evidence-based practices including classroom interventions based on student need and data show an acceleration of student academic, behavioral and social-emotional growth*
>
> **included in the district/school improvement plan*
>
> **includes parent and community supports, activities, and services [Sec. 31a(1), (11)]*

Not Applicable

Mark Not Applicable in the GEMS dropdown box for this indicator if not using Section 31a funds in this manner.

Expected Use in Practice

Generally, all of the following conditions are in place, and contribute to growth within the LEA.

- There are school-wide reforms that are guided by the district's CAN.
- The LEA documents and implements school-wide reform strategies/measures (instruction, interventions, curriculum, coaching, professional learning, leadership, parent/community involvement) designed to improve student outcomes.
- It impacts all grades in a building and includes sustained support to ensure improved student achievement.
- The programs are evaluated quarterly and yearly to assess effectiveness and impact on student achievement.

Unacceptable Use in Practice

Reform measures/strategies do not meet the intent and purposes of the law and/or are not evidence-based, **AND/OR** less than two of the expected use conditions are in place.

Example Evidence

Required: CNA, DIP/SIP; Evidence-based school-wide reform program description, including selection process meetings agendas, sign-in sheets; School-wide reform implementation plan; Local assessment data results; Evaluation of school-wide reform (data, narrative or meeting minutes).

7. The LEA meets the following requirements if expending funds for school security.

    *not more than 20% of the allocation is used

    *at least 50% of pupils were identified as Economically Disadvantaged during the preceding year

    *aligns to the intent and purposes of Section 31a

    *aligns to the comprehensive needs assessment and the multi-tiered system of supports model

    *is not used for administrative costs [Sec. 31a (5)]

Not Applicable

Mark Not Applicable in the GEMS dropdown box for this indicator if not using Section 31a funds in this manner.

Expected Use in Practice

Generally, all of the following conditions are in place, and contribute to growth within the LEA.

- **The LEA has established school security services that include all of the following.**
  - aligns with evidence-based best practices
  - focuses on prevention
  - provides for students' mental health
  - integrates physical and psychological safety
  - engages families and communities as partners
  - provides professional development to security staff and all personnel
  - establishes written procedures and processes for students and security personnel
- **The LEA's efforts include establishing trust among staff, students, and families; and creating an environment where students feel empowered to report safety concerns.**
- **The LEA has evidence of increased instructional time, and improved student behavior and academic achievement.**

Unacceptable Use in Practice

Less than four of the practices under the first bullet are present in the school security services,

AND/OR efforts do not include establishing trust among staff, students, and families; and creating an environment where students feel empowered to report safety concerns,

AND/OR evidence does not demonstrate an increase in instructional time nor an improvement in student behavior and academic achievement.

Example Evidence

Required: School security program, process, procedures, job responsibilities of security personnel; Data demonstrating the positive impact of security program/process on outcomes as a part of the MTSS framework, meeting agendas, sign-in sheets.

Additional Example Evidence (LEA Specifies): Perception survey data; DIP/SIP; discipline records.

8. The LEA meets the following for expending funds to provide an anti-bullying and/or crisis intervention program. [Sec. 31a(18)]
*aligns to the intent and purposes

*supports the implementation of MTSS

Not Applicable

Mark Not Applicable in the GEMS dropdown box for this indicator if not using Section 31a funds in this manner.

Expected Use in Practice

Generally, all of the following conditions are in place, and contribute to growth within the LEA.

- is research-based, comprehensive, and aligns with current State law (Section 380.1310b)
- has an established and trained committee consisting of staff, parents/families, and community members responsible for overseeing the program
- includes on-going, job-embedded LEA-/building-wide professional development provided to all employees with a clear understanding of their roles, responsibilities, and the necessary skills to fulfill them
- includes a program outline, communication to stakeholders, and the rules/procedures are enforced
- is evaluated annually for effectiveness, and adjustments are made to the program accordingly

Unacceptable Use in Practice

Less than three of the above practices are in place.

Example Evidence

Required: Evidence-based anti-bullying and/or crisis intervention program, employee roles and responsibilities, and Data demonstrating the positive impact of anti-bullying and/or crisis-intervention program.

Additional Example Evidence (LEA Specifies): Program evaluation summary.

9. The LEA meets the following requirements when expending funds for professional learning that:
   *expends no more than 7.5% of the allocation
   *is research-based
   *implements a coaching model that supports the MTSS framework
   *is provided to district, school leadership, and teachers
   *is aligned to MDE's professional learning standards
   *is solely related to one or more of the following: implementing MTSS with fidelity, utilizing data
   from MTSS to inform curriculum and instruction, or implementing section 1280f of the revised
   school code with fidelity [Sec. 31a (12)]

Not Applicable

Mark Not Applicable in the GEMS dropdown box for this indicator if not using Section 31a funds in this manner.

Expected Use in Practice

If professional learning is provided to staff (teachers, paraprofessionals, interventionists, school leaders, etc.), then attendance by a balanced cross-section of designated staff responsible for supporting and implementing the practice is evident and aligned with State professional learning standards,
AND generally, all of the following conditions are in place, and contribute to growth within the LEA.

- Professional Learning for the district or school leadership and teachers must be no more than 7.5% and is <u>solely</u> related to:
  - o Implementing the MTSS required in subsection (3) with fidelity;
  - o Utilizing data from MTSS to inform curriculum and instruction;
  - o Beginning to implement a coaching model that supports the MTSS framework required in subsection (3) with fidelity; or
  - o Directly implementing the Read by Grade Three Law with fidelity;
- Professional Learning meets the following requirements:
  - o Is research- and evidence-based and aligned with State professional learning standards; and
  - o Integrated into the LEA, school, and classroom practices

Unacceptable Use in Practice

Professional learning is not utilized for MTSS, implementation of the Read by Grade Three Law, or implementing a coaching model.

Example Evidence

Required: Professional learning plan, PLC calendar, agendas, and minutes showing how the learning is integrated into the district's, schools', and classroom practices; Alignment with the district-, building-, and student-level decision-making and use of data tools related to professional learning; evidence of implementation of professional development, fidelity checks, tools and procedures to ensure full implementation in classrooms by targeted staff; Evaluation of achieving the outcomes of professional learning; Classroom observations and walkthrough documentation, Professional learning surveys of educators for evaluation and implementation.
Additional Evidence (LEA Specifies): Fiscal report; billing receipts

10. The LEA meets the following for expending funds to support instructional or behavioral coaches:
*Aligns to the intent and purposes; and
*Supports the implementation of MTSS. [Sec. 31a (1), (13)]

Not Applicable

Mark Not Applicable in the GEMS dropdown box for this indicator if not using Section 31a funds in this manner.

Expected Use in Practice

The job responsibilities for instructional and behavioral coaches are clearly defined and fulfilled, align to the MDE definition of a coach, and support the intent and purposes of Section 31a, implementation of MTSS framework;

AND generally, all of the following conditions are in place, and coaches contribute to growth within the LEA by:

- Supporting the development of teachers through evidence-based practices with the goal of increasing student engagement, teacher capacity, improvement of student achievement across core curriculum subjects and behavioral outcomes;
- Supporting the growth and professional learning of an organization and its stakeholders;
- Modeling and facilitating best practices to achieve desired outcomes while providing feedback.
- Utilizing specialized knowledge and skills that builds the capacity of an organization;
- Developing rapport while objectively analyzing systems, infrastructure, and individuals who sustain continuous improvement;
- aligning the coaching framework and strategies with the objectives in the DIP/SIP and to improve teacher effectiveness;
- Impacting students' social and emotional growth utilizing proven, evidence-based practices to support a positive school culture; and
- There is evidence of increased instructional time, as well as improved student social behavior and academic achievement.

Unacceptable Use in Practice

There is little or no evidence the coaching role is fully implemented and is making an impact on increasing students' academics or decreasing behavior incidents; AND/OR less than four of the expected us indicators in place

Example Evidence

Required: Behavioral and/or Instructional Coach employee job descriptions including roles and responsibilities; Quarterly local student academic and/or behavioral data results; Documentation of coaching activities such coaching schedules, plans, logs, agendas/sign-in sheets, and debriefing notes with teachers.

Additional Example Evidence (LEA Specifies): MDE Coaching Definition (optional resource link).

Indicator Set 3 (11) – Program Report

Section 31a is a State School Aid Act categorical grant that requires an annual report to be submitted to the Michigan Department of Education annually by July 15. The purpose of this report, the Section 31a Annual Program and Fiscal Report (APFR) as required by Section 31a(9), is to provide to the state a brief description of each program conducted or services performed by the district or public school academy using funds under this section. The report includes the amount of funds under this section allocated to each of those programs or services, the total number of at-risk pupils served by each of those programs or services, and the data necessary for the department and the department of health and human services to verify matching funds for the temporary assistance for needy families program.

11. The LEA submits the Section 31a Annual Program and Fiscal Report by July 15. [Sec. 31a(9)]

Contributions to the Desired Outcome

Thoughtful and accurate completion of an APFR verifies funding was used appropriately in alignment with the law's intent and purposes.

Expected Use in Practice

The LEA has a set process and timeline for accurately and timely completion of the program report, which includes:

- a team of key stakeholders is involved in this process;
- a defined decision-making process is evident; and
- align with the LEA's continuous improvement efforts.

Unacceptable Use in Practice

The LEA does not have a set process and timeline for completing the APFR; <u>AND</u> less than two of the above conditions are in place.

Example Evidence

Required: Section 31a Annual Program & Fiscal Review; Expenditure Reports specific to Section 31a programs/services.

Indicator Set 4 (12-17) – Early Literacy, Numeracy, and MTSS

Section 31a(3) defines three assurances that must be in place by districts that utilize this categorical funding. Districts must comply with the Read By Grade Three law (MCL 380.1280f), use resources to address early literacy and numeracy, and implement a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) for at least grades K to 12, or all grades the district operates. The district must implement an evidence-based MTSS framework that includes the essential components, including:

- team-based leadership
- a tiered delivery system
- selection and implementation of instruction, interventions, and supports
- a comprehensive screening and assessment system
- continuous data-based decision making

The LEA implements MTSS at the elementary level and at the secondary level to identify students in jeopardy of not graduating on time, provide intervention, and monitor their progress. Key indicators include, but are not limited to, absences, course failure, grade point average, and behavior.

12. The LEA complies with Section 1280F of the Revised School Code, MCL 380.1280F (Read by Grade Three), and uses resources to address early literacy and numeracy. [Section 31a(3)]

Contributions to the Desired Outcome

Student achievement is accelerated by implementing a core, evidence-based curriculum with intervention supports designed to accelerate students' achievement in reading/numeracy. A highly structured reading/literacy curriculum that includes:

- explicit, and systematic implementation with varying intensity to meet students' needs
- frequent assessments (formative, summative, interim, diagnostic, progress monitoring)
- professional learning to support the growth of student achievement in reading/numeracy
- the five major reading components (phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, fluency, and reading comprehension)

Expected Use in Practice

Generally, seven or more of the following conditions are in place, which contributes to the growth within the LEA.

- coaching (modeling, co-teaching, feedback) supports the fidelity of reading/mathematics instruction through the building of support systems to build teacher capacity and scale the implementation of reading/mathematics instruction
- utilizes multiple measures of data (formative, summative, interim, diagnostic) at least 3 times per year and progress monitoring to inform and diagnose professional learning, interventions, classroom instruction and guide decision making
- establishes a collective vision for core reading/mathematics instruction through timely management of resources, building consensus and developing a culture around effective reading/mathematics instruction and implementation
- collaborates to provide needed resources for team collaboration, coaching, professional learning, and data-based decision making
- ensures that interventions are aligned, appropriate, timely, intensive, and systematic to accelerate student movement in tiered instruction
- communicates with parents/caregivers and external stakeholders to support district reading initiatives (IRIP, Read at Home Plan) and increase reading achievement
- provides appropriate language acquisition supports for English learners at all levels of proficiency
- develops written processes and procedures to comply with the Read by Grade Three Law

Developmental Use in Practice

The LEA has five or six of the conditions above in place.

Unacceptable Use in Practice

The LEA has four or less of the above conditions in place.

Example Evidence

Required: Written documentation showing compliance with Read by Grade Three such as IRIPs, parent notification letters, and RBG3 professional learning plan; Building master schedule (includes Tier 2 and 3 Interventions); Achievement trend data (benchmark/interim and progress monitoring), including growth in both early literacy and numeracy, K-3 retention data; Sign-in sheets, agenda, meeting notes from progress monitoring/data review/s; Record of interventions performed by teachers/interventionists responsible for delivery.

Additional Example Evidence (LEA Specifies):

13. The LEA implements team-based leadership. [Section 31a(3)(a)]

Contributions to the Desired Outcome

Teams (district, building, and educator) that collaborate and communicate contribute to the alignment and cohesion across the education system. The alignment and cohesion of leadership teams create sustainable, scalable, and engaging school climates to support the successful implementation of MTSS and learner achievement. (MDE MTSS Practice Profile).

Expected Use in Practice

The LEA has developed a district leadership team that includes collaboration, planning, study, data analysis, goal setting, and reflection that are necessary for the successful implementation of MTSS K-12 and; generally, six or more of the following conditions are in place.

- The LEA collaboratively develops and communicates a clear vision and belief system for MTSS implementation through written policies, procedures, and protocols in the district.
- The LEA ensures the essential elements of a collaborative district and school culture are in place to support MTSS leadership roles and responsibilities are clearly defined.
- The LEA demonstrates support for an efficient and effective implementation for MTSS through a commitment to resources necessary (time, professional learning, materials, staffing).
- The LEA provides opportunities for key stakeholders including LEA and school administrators, school personnel (Data, general, special educators, interventionists), parents/families, and other identified stakeholders (e.g., union and community representatives) to provide input on district initiatives related to MTSS, school improvement.
- The LEA ensures parent/guardian(s), caregivers and community are a collaborative part of the LEA's MTSS and engage in non-traditional ways to increase participation.
- The LEA ensures multiple measures of data are utilized and analyzed to develop action plans to drive team-based decision making.
- The LEA collaborates and communicates with parents/caregivers and external stakeholders in a variety of ways and non-traditional manner to increase buy-in and participation.
- The LEA ensures leadership teams are collective, collaborative, and balanced in the decision-making and prioritization of programming and funding initiatives to achieve student outcomes.

Developmental Use in Practice

The LEA has at least four or five of the above conditions in place.

Unacceptable Use in Practice

The LEA has three or less of the above conditions in place.

Example Evidence

Required: Written process and procedural manual for MTSS implementation and fidelity both at district and school levels; Master Schedule (Indicator #12); Local assessment calendar, meeting schedules, agendas, sign-in sheets, minutes showing alignment with the district, building, and student level decision-making and use of data tools, various team rosters; Professional learning documentation on formative, interim and summative assessments; Professional learning community calendar, agendas, sign-in sheets, and minutes showing alignment with the district, building, and student level decision-making and use of data tools; Programs, agendas, sign-in sheets, minutes and attendance logs for district parent/community partner meetings, activities that support the intent and purposes of Section 31a.

Additional Example Evidence (LEA Specifies): Professional learning community calendar, agendas, and minutes showing alignment with LEA-, building-, and student-level decision-making and use of data tools (See Indicator 8).

14. The LEA implements a tiered delivery system. [Section 31a(3)(b)]

Contributions to the Desired Outcome

The framework of a multi-tiered approach provides for efficient, effective, and equitable allocation of resources within the educational system. When appropriately used, the tiers support each and every learner to experience success by meeting their unique needs (MDE MTSS Practice Profile).

Expected Use in Practice

Generally, eight or more of the following conditions are in place in the LEA.

- The LEA implements a district curriculum grounded in state standards that clearly identifies expectations for student learning (academics & behavior), with identified resources and guidance for the delivery of instruction.
- The LEA establishes, implements, and appropriately communicates ambitious academic and behavior standards/goals to LEA leaders, teachers, and community stakeholders that meets the needs of most (e.g., 80% or more).
- The LEA develops and implements with fidelity processes and procedures for students to be identified for small group interventions, as well as individualized supports that are integrated seamlessly into the master schedule in addition to their core instruction.
- The LEA provides procedures and directions for selection, training, and coaching of support personnel at all three tiers of support, in addition to differentiating the instruction to meet the diverse cognitive, physical, behavioral, social, and emotional needs of learners.
- The LEA provides professional learning communities for educators to consistently review data that will inform and diagnose classroom instruction and discuss/monitor individual students' needs and rate of progress toward grade-level mastery.
- The LEA ensures multiple measures are utilized to evaluate student placement in supports, and to accelerate achievement for students that are performing below grade level.
- The LEA ensures instructional goals and resources are utilized at all three tiers to review and assess for alignment to the state content standards.
- A team of professionals is consistently available to problem-solve the needs of students academically, behaviorally, and social-emotionally.
- The LEA identifies students' needs, and implements the continuum of timely and supplemental supports/strategies needed to intensify interventions.
- The LEA communicates opportunities for parent, family, and community partnerships to collaborate to meet the academic, behavioral, and social-emotional needs of all students.

Developmental Use in Practice

The LEA has six or seven of the above conditions in place.

Unacceptable Use in Practice

The LEA has five or less of the above conditions in place.

Example Evidence

Required: Written process and procedural manual for MTSS implementation and fidelity both LEA and building level (uploaded, Indicator 13); LEA instructional evaluation and observation documents; LEA's curriculum scope, sequence, and pacing guide documents; Interventionists/Tutor's schedules; Student Intervention results; documentation of services provided; Evidence-based core instruction and intervention program descriptions; Documentation showing parents/families receive information on MTSS process, supports, and student progress; Communication regarding child's progress to parent/family in a language they can understand; Documentation showing parent/family engagement with a plan to assist their child's behavioral/academic achievement; Programs, agendas, minutes and attendance logs for parent meetings, and community partnership activities that support the intent and purposes of Section 31a.

Additional Example Evidence (LEA Specifies):

Section 31a PRCG v 4.0 –April 2021

15. The LEA selects and implements instruction, interventions, and supports. [Section 31a(3)(c)]

Contributions to the Desired Outcome

The LEA selects instructional practices, interventions, and supports that are compatible with the local context and learner needs and assets increases the probability that interventions and supports will be successful, as demonstrated by improved outcomes for individuals within the local system (MDE MTSS Practice Profile).

Expected Use in Practice

Generally, six or more of the following conditions are in place.

- The LEA appropriately selects the curriculum, interventions, and intensive supports that:
    - meet the grade-level state standards
    - ensure a rigorous and accessible curriculum
    - shows evidence of cultural responsiveness and efficacy with the learner demographic population
    - meet ESSA's thresholds for high quality, evidence-based practices
- The LEA implements a problem-solving process to review, select and evaluate the effectiveness of instruction, interventions, and intense supports as a component of their CIP.
- The LEA engages staff and families in the selection and implementation of the curriculum, including involvement during the selection process, feedback opportunities, workshops, and two-way communication regarding programming.
- The LEA develops and implements with fidelity clear procedures for implementing Tier 2 and 3 programming that ensures all educators have access to the materials, time, and space necessary for the acceleration of students performing below grade level in reading, mathematics, and/or behavior.
- The LEA provides job-embedded and on-going professional learning for the implementation of core instruction, interventions, intensive supports, and effective teaching practices.
- The LEA the master schedule is reviewed to include small group interventions, as well as individualized supports that are integrated seamlessly to meet the needs of the whole child.
- The LEA engages community partners, providers, and families to provide access to social services (health, social, recreational) and supplemental educational services to support the whole child.

Developmental Use in Practice

The LEA has four or five of the above conditions in place.

Unacceptable Use in Practice

The LEA has three or less of the above conditions in place.

Example Evidence

Required: Written process and procedural manual for MTSS implementation and fidelity both district and school levels (uploaded in Indicator 13); LEA's curriculum scope, sequence, pacing guide documents; Evidence of instructional fidelity of implementation of instruction, interventions, and supports such as school-wide and/or intervention schedules, instruction observation logs, lesson plans, coaching feedback, Intervention Progress results, agendas, sign-in sheets and activity logs; Evidence-based early intervention (Tier 2) program descriptions and delivery guidance, selection process; Evidence-based intense (Tier 3) intervention program descriptions and delivery guidance, selection process; Achievement/Behavioral/Attendance trend data (benchmark/interim and progress monitoring) which includes growth in both early literacy and numeracy and impact of the implementation of K-12 At-risk programming/services on students' academic and behavioral outcomes.

Additional Example Evidence (LEA Specifies): Student Progress Monitoring Documentation (optional resource link).

16. The LEA has and implements a comprehensive screening and assessment system. [Section 31a(3)(d)]

Contributions to the Desired Outcome

A comprehensive assessment system contributes to an outcomes-driven approach that includes a meaningful monitoring and evaluation component and a commitment to continuous improvement (MDE MTSS Practice Profile).

Expected Use in Practice

Generally, seven or more of the following conditions are in place.

- The LEA selects and supports the use of universal screening tools and activities that:
    - address several components of the whole child
    - are quick, efficient, valid, reliable, and predictive of future learner outcomes
    - are appropriate for the learners in the setting
    - are monitored for the fidelity of administration and data entry (as applicable)
    - are designed for the intended purpose of screening rather than assessment
- The LEA selects and supports the use of progress monitoring tools and diagnostic assessments.
- The LEA develops a written process and procedure that articulates usage of the district's assessment system.
- The LEA frequently utilizes student-level academic and behavior assessment data for early intervention identification, student growth, and adjusting instruction.
- The LEA providing on-going, effective professional learning/training for administration of and utilizing data from all selected assessments.
- The LEA annually evaluates the effectiveness of the assessment system to determine future needs.
- The LEA regularly communicates the LEAs assessment process, procedures, and calendar with parents, caregivers, and stakeholders.
- The LEA develops and implements with fidelity written protocols for communicating assessment results with learners and parents/families in a language and format they can understand.

Developmental Use in Practice

The LEA has five or six of the above conditions in place.

Unacceptable Use in Practice

The LEA has four or less of the above conditions in place.

Example Evidence

Required: Written process and procedural manual for MTSS implementation and fidelity both district and school levels (uploaded, Indicator 13); LEA universal, screening, diagnostic, and progress monitoring assessment descriptions; Assessment procedures, data tools, and fidelity check documentation; Local assessment calendar showing alignment with the district, building, and student level decision-making and use of data tools, agendas, sign-in sheets.

Additional Example Evidence (LEA Specifies):

17. The LEA uses continuous data-based decision making. [Section 31a(3)(e)]

Contributions to the Desired Outcome

Data analysis allows for evidence to guide decision-making for both the system's effectiveness and the whole child's needs of all learners, with explicit consideration for special populations. Examination of data trends as they are disaggregated by a group may surface and provide insight into systemic issues that may be disproportionality impacting specific populations of learners. Data-based decisions should ensure that all learners are provided an appropriately challenging learning environment designed to accelerate their growth (MDE MTSS Practice Profile).

Expected Use in Practice

Generally, seven or more of the following conditions are in place.

- The LEA maintains an efficient data collection system and written protocols to ensure collection, entry, and access to whole child data.
- The LEA regularly uses multiple types of data (capacity, input, process, outcome, perception, fidelity, and scale-up) to enhance leadership, organizational strategies, policies, and competency drivers within the system.
- The LEA ensures that building-level teams meet consistently to problem solve and develop action plans to improve the efficacy of instruction, interventions, and intensive supports.
- The LEA ensures data is used to drive instructional and non-instructional decisions, identifies and addresses inequities.
- The LEA ensures data is used to drive decisions for professional learning that supports the effective use of instructional and non-instructional data for diagnosing building/classrooms/individual students' needs.
- The LEA analyzes data three times a year to determine the effectiveness of the district-wide MTSS framework <u>AND</u> the needs and progress for all learners, with explicit consideration, acceleration for special populations.
- The LEA uses a specific problem-solving process that occurs three times per year, which includes:
  - a CNA to determine current needs, gaps, and resource allocation within the LEA
  - use of aggregated and disaggregated learner outcome data for whole child needs
  - setting and assessing progress toward goals within the LEA and school improvement process
  - addressing individual or group need
  - evaluation of the effectiveness of practices
  - maps, aligns, and reallocates resources in response to outcomes (fiscal, personnel, time, facilities, etc.)
- The LEA develops and implements written procedures for communication regarding student level and aggregate data to various key stakeholders in a language and format that are appropriate for the audience.
- The LEA ensures that on-going professional learning on continuous data-based decision making is evaluated to improve the support systems and building level teams.

Developmental Use in Practice

T**he LEA has five or six of the conditions in place.**

Unacceptable Use in Practice

The LEA has four or less conditions in place.

Example Evidence

Required: Written process and procedural manual for MTSS implementation and fidelity both district and school levels (uploaded, Indicator 13); Documentation of collaborative problem-solving model; DIP/SIP (reviewed in ASSIST); CNA Summary (uploaded, Indicator 1); Data analysis summaries that show effective Tier 1 instruction and delivery; Data analysis summaries that show determination/selection of students for early (Tier 2) and/or intense (Tier 3) intervention; Local assessment calendar, meeting schedules, agendas, sign-in sheets and minutes showing alignment with the district, building, and student level decision-making and use of data tools (uploaded, Indicator 12); Program Evaluation Tool or other evaluation tool (uploaded, Indicator 1)

Additional Example Evidence (LEA Specifies): Data presentations.