



Coordinator Name

Paul Bauer

Planning Team

Matthew Traugher

Evaluation Summary

Purpose or Mandate

The purpose of the Disaggregated Data report is to inform the Board of Education and other district stakeholders of the results and implications of the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) report. This data report supports CSIP Goal Area 1 (Develop and enhance educational/instructional programs to improve performance and enable students to meet their personal, academic and career goals), and PCF process 1.1.3 (Conduct internal analysis of educational programs, support, and operation services).

Program Description

This report details MSIP Annual Performance Report (APR) results and their implications. It includes an in-depth analysis of each criterion in the APR report and trends over three years. A preliminary data report (Initial Disaggregated Data) was published previously this school year that provided detailed analysis of the results of 2014-15 state accountability assessments specifically.

The district APR is comprised of scores for each of the MSIP 5 Performance Standards: (1) Academic Achievement, (2) Subgroup Achievement, (3) Career and College Readiness, (4) Attendance Rate, and (5) Graduation Rate. Status, Progress, and Growth (in the case of Achievement) metrics inform the calculation of a comprehensive score used to determine the accreditation level of a school district. For each of these five Standards, DESE requires that districts either meet state performance standards (as indicated by the Status metric), or alternately demonstrate adequate improvement (as indicated by the Progress and/or Growth metrics). See Appendix A for further description of APR measures and scoring guidelines for Standards 1 and 2.

What were the major accomplishments or benefits of this program?

Reporting and analysis of SSD performance on MSIP metrics allows for identification of district trends, accomplishments, and opportunities for improvement. It is expected that the district's continuous improvement process will address opportunities for improvement and that the district will meet criteria for maintaining accreditation per DESE standards.

How well did this program fulfill its purpose or mandate?

Inadequate Approaching Satisfactory Satisfactory Excellent

Not applicable. This report does not evaluate any specific program.

What factors made essential contributions (+/-) to this rating?

Not applicable. This report does not evaluate any specific program.

What is the general level of customer or stakeholder satisfaction with this program?

Not at all Satisfied Somewhat Satisfied Very Satisfied Completely Satisfied

Not applicable. This report does not evaluate any specific program.

What factors made essential contributions (+/-) to this rating?

Not applicable. This report does not evaluate any specific program.

Evaluation Results

Special School District achieved full accreditation status on the basis of the 2015 APR. The overall results are reported below, followed by results for each individual MSIP 5 Standard.

MSIP 5 Summary (All Indicators)

Table 1 displays a summary of APR scoring across MSIP 5 Standards. Results are summarized in the bullets below:

- SSD earned a greater percentage of available APR points in 2015 than was earned in either of the prior two years.
- The percentage of available points earned in 2015 (85.4%) fell in the bottom quartile of K-12 districts in Missouri in 2015. The average APR percentage among K-12 districts in 2015 was 91.4% (median 93.2%).
- The district APR has improved considerably over three years in the Standard of College and Career Readiness.
- SSD earned 100% of available points in the Graduation Rate standard, exceeding performance of the prior two years. However, points earned were due entirely to the 7-year graduation cohort (see further analysis below).
- The district has consistently failed to earn APR points in the Attendance standard.
- SSD would have earned fewer APR points in the Standard of Academic Achievement were a “hold harmless” exception not put into place for 2015 (see further description and analysis below).

Table 1
APR Summary

APR Standard	Total Points Possible	2013		2014		2015	
		Points	Points	% of Points	% of Points	Points	% of Points
1. Academic Achievement	56	48	85.7%	54	96.4%	53	94.6%
2. Subgroup Achievement	14	12	85.7%	13.5	96.4%	13	92.9%
3. College and Career Ready (CCR)	30	10	33.3%	18	60.0%	23.5	78.3%
4. Attendance	10	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
5. Graduation Rate	30	22.5	75.0%	18	60.0%	30	100%
APR Total Points	140	92.5	66.1%	103.5	73.9%	119.5	85.4%

Note. Scores that were lower in 2015 than in 2014 are highlighted in orange. Scores that were higher in 2015 than in 2014 are highlighted in green.

MSIP 5 Standard 1: Academic Achievement

DESE instituted a “hold harmless” exception for APR Standards 1 & 2 in the areas of English Language Arts (ELA) and math as a response to the introduction of several new state assessments (the standards-aligned Smarter Balanced Assessment for MAP, and the Dynamic Learning Maps for MAP-A) in 2014-15. The *MSIP 5 Comprehensive Guide to the Missouri School Improvement Program* (September 2015 update) describes the APR calculation procedure for Standards 1 and 2 under the hold harmless exception as follows:

The Department will calculate and report 2015 assessment data for all LEAs. Once completed, the Department will examine the total points earned for ELA and mathematics within Standards 1 and 2. If the total points earned in 2014 in ELA or mathematics are greater than in 2015, the 2014 total points earned will be used in the calculation of the 2015 APR. (Note: This policy does not apply to science and social studies within Standards 1 and 2, nor does it apply to Standards 3, 4, or 5. These standards will be calculated in the same manner as in years past and will include 2015 data.) Example: An LEA received 15 points in Standard 1 ELA in 2014 and receives 9 points in Standard 1 ELA in 2015. In this case, the Department will utilize the 2014 total of 15 points toward the calculation of the 2015 APR. (p. 10)

Students in grades 3-8 will be administered yet another new exam in 2016; it is unknown whether DESE will offer a similar hold harmless exception. There is also potential for changes to the testing regimen in coming years in connection with the recent passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act, which includes revised provisions for accountability assessment.

Table 2 displays the APR results for the Standard of Academic Achievement over the prior three years. MPI¹ refers to the MAP Performance Index. The “Status” measure reflects APR points awarded based on a district’s three-year average of the metric of interest (e.g., the MPI). The “Progress” measure is an indicator of group improvement from one two-year period to another (e.g., the average of the 2013 and 2014 metrics is compared to the average of the 2014 and 2015 metrics). It is based on standardized group MPI scores, and includes all students who took a state assessment in a given year. The “Growth” measure is an indicator of the extent to which individual students demonstrated a predicted/expected amount of growth from one year to the next. Growth is based entirely on the standardized MAP scores of students in grades 4-8 (this excludes MAP-A and EOC exams). The predicted benchmark is unique to each student and derives from a relatively complex statistical calculation. These metrics are explained in more detail in Appendix A. The following bullets summarize APR results for Standard 1.

- Fewer Status points were earned in 2015 vs. 2014 in the areas of ELA and Math (the district earned no Status points in math in 2015). SSD has earned all available Status points in science each of the last three years. The district earned Status points in Social Studies for the first time in three years. However, for reasons discussed below, the district is also at risk for earning fewer Academic Achievement APR points in 2015-16 given similar levels of performance.
- SSD earned almost all Growth points but no Progress points. Given that district ELA and math MPI scores decreased considerably more than the average cross-year change among districts in the state in 2015 (see Initial Disaggregated Data report), it is unsurprising that no Progress points were earned. Growth points earned suggest that the subset of SSD students whose scores contribute to this metric showed individual improvements from 2014 to 2015 that exceeded statistical predictions. Some of these gains, however, may actually represent statistical artifacts resulting from (1) oddly low 2014 standardized scores (NCEs²) which in turn set the bar for

meeting the subsequent year growth prediction very low, and (2) a seemingly lower level of expected Growth generated by the regression formula for students whose predictor/baseline score is lower, and/or who attend schools with lower average MAP performance, and/or that are affected by high mobility. Given the abstruse nature of this calculation, it is difficult to predict whether SSD can expect to achieve a similar number of APR Growth points in future years.

- Based on the hold harmless exception, the APR calculation included Total Points in math from 2014 rather than 2015. The APR score in this areas would have been lower were the hold harmless exception not in place. If SSD students perform similarly in 2016, it is likely that these same Status points will not be achieved.

Table 2
Standard 1 (Academic Achievement) APR Results

	APR Points Possible	MPI/APR Points 2013	MPI/APR Points 2014	MPI/APR Points 2015	3 year Avg/2015 Classification
English Language Arts					
MPI		377.7	373.7	240.9	330.8
Status	16.0	12.0	12.0	9.0	Approaching
Progress	12.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Floor
Growth	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	Exceeding
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress or Growth)	16.0	16.0	16.0	16.0	
Mathematics					
MPI		369.9	359.1	166.5	298.5
Status	16.0	12.0	12.0	0.0	Floor
Progress	12.0	12.0	0.0	0.0	Floor
Growth	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	Exceeding
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress or Growth)	16.0	16.0	16.0	12.0	
Science					
MPI		386.2	359.8	364.2	370.1
Status	16.0	16.0	16.0	16.0	2020 Target
Progress	12.0	12.0	6.0	0.0	Floor
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress)	16.0	16.0	16.0	16.0	
Social Studies					
MPI		n/a	324.4	300.0	312.2
Status	8.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	Approaching
Progress	6.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	Floor
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress)	8.0	0.0	6.0	5.0	

Note. Scores that were lower in 2015 than in 2014 are highlighted in orange. Scores that were higher in 2015 than in 2014 are highlighted in green. 2014 Total Point scores that were used to calculate the 2015 APR under the hold harmless exception are bolded.

MSIP 5 Standard 2: Subgroup Achievement

DESE requires that the state assessment performance of students identified as being members of subgroups including free/reduced price lunch, non-white racial/ethnic background, English language learners, and students with disabilities, meets or exceeds the state standard or demonstrates required improvement. Most students served by SSD are considered to be a member of a subgroup per the DESE definition. Exceptions would include students who attend career/technical schools or are served through the Courts program who do not have an IEP or otherwise meet an inclusive subgroup designation. Because a large proportion of SSD students fall in a subgroup, generally APR trends in Standard 2 mirror overall district achievement trends of Standard 1. APR results for Standard 2 are displayed in Table 3.

Table 3
Standard 2 (Subgroup Achievement) APR Results

	APR Points Possible	MPI/APR Points 2013	MPI/APR Points 2014	MPI/APR Points 2015	3 year Avg/2015 Classification
English Language Arts					
MPI		377.2	373.1	240.3	330.2
Status	4.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	Approaching
Progress	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Floor
Growth	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	On Track
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress or Growth)	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	
Mathematics					
MPI		369.9	359.4	166.2	298.5
Status	4.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	Floor
Progress	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	Floor
Growth	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	Exceeding
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress or Growth)	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	
Science					
MPI		385.4	358.8	364.1	369.4
Status	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	2020 Target
Progress	3.0	3.0	2.0	0.0	Floor
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress)	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	
Social Studies					
MPI		n/a	321.5	298.0	309.8
Status	2.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	Approaching
Progress	1.5	0.0	1.5	0.0	Floor
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress)	2.0	0.0	1.5	1.0	

Note. Scores that were lower in 2015 than in 2014 are highlighted in orange. Scores that were higher in 2015 than in 2014 are highlighted in green. 2014 Total Point scores that were used to calculate the 2015 APR under the hold harmless exception are bolded.

MSIP 5 Standard 3: College and Career Ready (CCR)

How well the district has provided adequate post-secondary preparation for students is evaluated by the extent to which the following indicators meet the state standard or demonstrate required improvement:

1. The percent of graduates who scored at or above the state standard on any department-approved measure(s) of college and career readiness, for example, the ACT, SAT, COMPASS, or Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) (Standard 3: 1-3 - CCR Assessments);
2. The percent of students who earned a qualifying score on an Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), or Technical Skills Attainment (TSA) assessments (including IRC) and/or receive college credit through early college, dual enrollment, or approved dual credit courses (Standard 3: 4 - Advanced Placement);
3. The percent of graduates who attend post-secondary education/training or are in the military within six (6) months of graduating, OR the percent of graduates who complete career education programs approved by the department and are placed in occupations directly related to their training, continue their education, or are in the military within six (6) months of graduating (Standard 3: 5-6 - Postsecondary Placement).

APR scores for Standard 3 are displayed in Table 4. Results are summarized by sub-standard in the bullets below.

- Standard 3:1 (percent at or above state standards on assessments):
 - SSD students have met this standard at an increasingly high rate over 3 years. The 3-year *Status* standard for "On Track" is 64.3%-71.4% (the "Approaching" standard is 40%-64.2%). Given SSD's most recent 2-year average of 45.4%, it is likely that the district's Status score will stay at the Approaching level for the near future given consistent or gradually improved performance.
 - SSD has shown improvement in each of last three years on the career readiness assessments *Progress* metric. The district nearly earned a Progress rating of "On Track" (a 9.47 percentage point increase from 2014-2015 was needed; the improvement for SSD was 8.5 percentage points). A similar increase from 2015 to 2016 would result in an "On Track" Progress rating.
- Standard 3:4 (percent with qualifying score on Advanced Placement assessment):
 - SSD earned "On Track" Status for the advanced placement standard in 2015, and the percentage of students meeting the standard has increased consistently over the previous three years. Given another modest improvement in 2016 to 52.6% or greater of students meeting the standard (from 49.7% in 2015), SSD would meet the current "2020 Target" Status threshold based on 3-year average.
 - The district met the Approaching level for Progress. Another significant increase in 2016 (7.8%) would be required to reach the On Track Progress level.

- Standard 3:5-6 (Postsecondary Placement):
 - Performance in the postsecondary placement category declined markedly from 2014 to 2015 (the percent earning a qualifying scores fell to 68.5% from 85.2% in 2014 and 83.5% in 2013). It is likely that the district will again earn Approaching status in 2016 given similar performance. A marked increase (to 87.6%) would be required in 2016 to meet the Approaching criteria for Progress.

Table 4
Standard 3 (College and Career Readiness) APR Results

	APR Points Possible	MPI/APR Points 2013	MPI/APR Points 2014	MPI/APR Points 2015	3 year Avg/2015 Classification
1-3 CCR Assessments					
% at or Above State Standard		32.6%	41.1%	49.7%	41.1%
Status	10.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	Approaching
Progress	7.5	0.0	2.0	2.0	Approaching
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress)	10.0	0.0	2.0	8.0	
4 Advanced Placement					
% at or Above State Standard		32.2%	41.8%	50.2%	41.4%
Status	10.0	6.0	6.0	7.5	On Track
Progress	7.5	7.5	4.0	2.0	Approaching
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress)	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.5	
5-6 Postsecondary Placement					
% Earning Qualifying Score		83.5%	85.2%	68.5%	79.1%
Status	10.0	0.0	6.0	6.0	Approaching
Progress	7.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	Floor
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress)	10.0	0.0	6.0	6.0	

Note. Scores that were lower in 2015 than in 2014 are highlighted in orange. Scores that were higher in 2015 than in 2014 are highlighted in green.

MSIP 5 Standard 4: Attendance

DESE requires that the percentage of students who regularly attend school meets or exceeds the state standard or demonstrates improvement. Attendance targets use individual student's attendance rate and set the expectation that 90% of the students are in attendance 90% of the time. Attendance is based on proportional weights that consider the extent of the year each student was enrolled in the district.

SSD has earned zero APR points for attendance each of the last three years. The weighted percentage of students with attendance above 90% declined in 2015. To earn Status points in 2016 (by reaching the "Approaching" level), SSD's percent above 90 would need to increase to 88.6% in 2016, which is unlikely given the three year trend. Progress points would be possible given an increase in the attendance metric to 79.5% or higher in 2016. Attendance APR trends are shown in Table 5.

Table 5
Standard 4 (Attendance) APR Results

	APR Points Possible	MPI/APR Points 2013	MPI/APR Points 2014	MPI/APR Points 2015	3 year Avg/2015 Classification
Attendance					
% Above 90%		78.9%	78.0%	73.4%	76.8%
Status	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Floor
Progress	7.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	Floor
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress)	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	

Note. Scores that were lower in 2015 than in 2014 are highlighted in orange. Scores that were higher in 2015 than in 2014 are highlighted in green.

MSIP 5 Standard 5: Graduation Rate

This standard requires that districts ensure students complete high school. The metric used for evaluation is the percent of students who complete an educational program at a rate that meets or exceeds the state standard or demonstrates required improvement. The *highest rate* across graduate cohort years 4, 5, 6, and 7 is what is used in the APR (inclusion of a 7-year graduation rate began in 2014). Table 6 displays APR graduation rate results. Key trends are described in the bullets below.

- SSD earned all of the 30 points possible for Standard 5 in 2015 (through a combination of status and progress points). This was due almost entirely to the 7-year graduation rate. No status points were earned for 4-year, 5-year, and 6-year graduation rates, though the 6-year improvement contributed to achieving an "approaching" level of progress in 2015 (worth 6 APR points).
- With modest gains in the 2015 6-year rate of 71.1%, it is likely that the 2016 7-year rate will again achieve "on track" status. The 7-year rate would need to maintain or increase to again earn progress points. Therefore it is possible that Standard 5 APR points will decrease in 2016.

Table 6
Standard 5 (Graduation Rate) APR Results

	APR Points Possible	MPI/APR Points 2013	MPI/APR Points 2014	MPI/APR Points 2015	3 year Avg/2015 Classification
Four-Year Graduation Rate					
4-Yr Rate		69.5%	63.5%	72.6%	68.5%
Status	30	0.0	0.0	0	Floor
Progress	22.5	22.5	6.0	0	Floor
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress)	30.0	22.5	6.0	0	
Five-Year Graduation Rate					
5-Yr Rate		58.0%	62.9%	59.3%	60.1%
Status	30	0.0	0.0	0	Floor
Progress	22.5	6.0	6.0	0	Floor
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress)	30.0	6.0	6.0	0	
Six-Year Graduation Rate					
6-Yr Rate		61.7%	66.4%	71.1%	66.4%
Status	30	0.0	0.0	0	Floor
Progress	22.5	0.0	6.0	6	Approaching
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress)	30.0	0.0	6.0	6	
Seven-Year Graduation Rate					
7-Yr Rate		n/a	80.3%	84.9%	82.6%
Status	30	n/a	18.0	22.5	On Track
Progress	22.5	n/a	0.0	22.5	Exceeding
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress)	30.0	n/a	18.0	30.0	

Note. Scores that were lower in 2015 than in 2014 are highlighted in orange. Scores that were higher in 2015 than in 2014 are highlighted in green.

Readers should keep in mind that SSD is somewhat unique with respect to graduation in that (a) some proportion of students attending separate public schools attend through age 21, (b) the district is technically “responsible” for the graduation of some students who ultimately are provided services for relatively brief periods of time (i.e., students who are placed through the courts but then drop out), (c) a sizeable number of students who attend SSD schools or placements actually graduate from partner districts (this includes students who attend South Technical High School and many students who attend special education vocational placements), and (d) the fact that a common goal of special educators is to return students to less restrictive settings; thus students receiving special education through SSD schools who show the most significant improvements (i.e., students who may be more likely to graduate “on time”) may in some cases transition back to partner districts prior to the end of their senior year of high school.

What do customers and other stakeholders consider to be the strengths and opportunities for improvement/weaknesses of the program?

<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>The district earned full accreditation in 2015.</i>• <i>Student performance on College and Career Readiness assessments has steadily improved over three years.</i>• <i>The percent of students earning a qualifying score on Advanced Placement and/or Technical Skills Assessments has steadily increased over three years.</i>• <i>SSD earned all possible APR points for Graduation Rate.</i>
<p>Opportunities/Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>For MSIP Standards 1 (Academic Achievement) and 2 (Subgroup Achievement), SSD benefitted from DESE's hold harmless exception in 2015. Barring and possibly even with a similar exception being granted for the current school year, it is likely that APR points earned for these Standards will decrease in 2016.</i>• <i>The percent of students found to have satisfactory post-secondary placements/outcomes declined in 2015.</i>• <i>SSD failed to earn APR points in the Attendance standard for the third consecutive year.</i>• <i>SSD remains in the lower quartile of districts in Missouri with respect to percentage of total APR points achieved.</i>• <i>The state's adoption of another new accountability assessment aligned with revised learning standards, along with the recent passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act that modifies accountability mandates for states, will likely lead to uncertainty in accreditation standards and requirements for SSD in coming years.</i>

How well aligned are the program's processes with the goals of the program?

<p><i>Not applicable. This report does not evaluate any specific program.</i></p>

Deployment Level of Program Services

- Little or no deployment of program services.
- The program services are in the early stages of deployment in most areas or schools.
- Services are deployed, although some areas or schools are in early stages of deployment.
- Services are well deployed, although deployment may vary in some areas or schools.
- Services are well deployed, with no significant gaps.
- Services are fully deployed without significant weaknesses or gaps in any areas or schools.
- Not applicable.

Should resources be changed to improve this program?

- Yes No

If Yes, describe changes.

Not applicable. This report does not evaluate any specific program.

Should goals be changed, added or removed?

Yes

No

If Yes, describe changes.

The authors of this report welcome ideas from stakeholders regarding additional analyses that might further inform district improvement efforts.

Evaluation Implications

What are the actual costs of this program, and how do they compare to budget?

This and subsequent sections pertaining to costs are not applicable, as the report does not evaluate any specific program.

What are the major sources and amounts of funds?

How many customers (students) are served by this program?

What is this program's annual cost per customer (student)?

\$ _____

Estimated Cost Effectiveness

- Mandated program; costs cannot be significantly reduced.
- Mandated program; costs could be reduced (include in Action Plan, below).
- Benefits greatly outweigh costs.
- Benefits outweigh cost, but improvement appears possible (include in Action Plan, below).
- Costs outweigh benefits (include in Action Plan, below).

General Recommendation Resulting from this Evaluation

- Continue the program as is. It is meeting or exceeding all expected outcomes.
- Continue the program as is with specific action plans for improvement.
- Expand the program, replicating effective components.
- Streamline, refine, or consolidate elements of the program.
- Redesign the program.
- Reevaluate the purpose and/or goals of the program.
- Discontinue ineffective or nonessential program components.
- Discontinue the program.
- Other: Not applicable.

Action Plans

Review of Action Plan progress since last report.

Action Plan 1

Opportunity for Improvement

MSIP Standard of Academic Achievement.

Action Plan

English Language Arts and Mathematics are areas in which small improvements could result in significant gain in MSIP points. Targeting these areas especially in preparation for MAP testing is cost efficient in terms of instructional time to MSIP points.

Progress on Action Plan

The District has implemented research-based interventions on a pilot basis. The data from these interventions is largely positive. As a result, the District is exploring expanding use of these interventions as well as additional research-based interventions. Because the nature of state assessments has changed and is anticipated to continue to do so for the next two years, preparation for specific assessments is very difficult; the above interventions aim at improvement in specific skills, which should lead to improved performance on assessments.

Action Plan 2

Opportunity for Improvement

MSIP Standard of Academic Achievement.

Action Plan

Provide principals with logical targets for students in their building based on previous MAP scores and formative assessments.

Progress on Action Plan

Principals receive data showing the performance of students in each subgroup on state and local assessments. Working collaboratively with their school leadership teams, they develop school improvement plans to address improvement on MSIP indicators.

Action Plan 3

Opportunity for Improvement

MSIP Standard of Attendance.

Action Plan

Efforts to maintain attendance at first semester levels could result in scoring points on attendance for the first time. If we can maintain student attendance we can earn points.

Progress on Action Plan

Improving attendance is an objective included in the District CSIP. A workgroup has developed a process for analyzing student absences, and ultimately using that information to identify outside supports to families and students to improve school attendance.

Action Plan 4

<p>Opportunity for Improvement New accountability assessments.</p>
<p>Action Plan Monitor the effects of DLM and Smarter Balanced assessments and provide DESE with evidence of any unfair implications for students with special needs.</p>
<p>Progress on Action Plan As highlighted in this report and in the Initial Disaggregated Data report, the advent of new assessments and proficiency standards correlated with a substantial decrease in proficiency rates for SSD students in the subject areas of ELA and math. Internal study of factors impacting District student performance on state assessments is currently being conducted.</p>

Action Plan 5

<p>Opportunity for Improvement Accountability requirements for students receiving special education services.</p>
<p>Action Plan Work closely with DESE to establish reasonable measures of accountability in cases where the measures for other districts are not appropriate for our student population.</p>
<p>Progress on Action Plan Based on the results of analyses of student attendance and performance on state assessments, the District will attempt to open discussions with DESE on these issues.</p>

What specific actions are needed in the next evaluation cycle?

Short-term (within the next school year)

Closely monitor DESE actions and legislative developments pertaining to school accountability requirements and how these might impact SSD.

Initiate discussions with DESE regarding the appropriateness and implications of accountability requirements for District students.

Medium-term (1-2 years)

Maintain District efforts to develop and implement interventions and programs designed to improve key student outcomes that are reflected in the APR.

Long-term (3 years and more)

None

Notes

1. The MSIP/MAP Index calculation is based on individual student achievement level. Students are assigned an achievement score based on their achievement level for each content area test taken, as follows: Below Basic=1, Basic=3, Proficient=4, Advanced=5. Using those scores, the formula for calculating the MSIP Index for a student group, building, or district is:

$$(\text{Sum of Student Achievement Scores/Number of Students}) * 100$$

The minimum MSIP/MAP Index Score is 100, and the maximum score is 500. Note that the current MSIP 5 formula essentially “penalizes” Below Basic scores. Per the MSIP 5 user guide (revised September 2015), “Assigning one (1) point to the Below Basic achievement level and three (3) points for the Basic achievement level supports Missouri’s expectation of placing every child on a path towards Proficiency. The additional point spread is designed to recognize, through year-to-year improvement in the MPI, the movement of students from this least desirable achievement level.” To illustrate the impact of this formula, the Index score for a group of 60 students whose scores are equally divided among the categories of Below Basic, Basic, and Proficient, would be 2.67 (not 3.0, which may seem like an intuitive “median” score for this distribution).

2. The Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) is a norm-referenced score that is similar to a percentile rank, but unlike percentile ranks, it is based on an equal interval scale. This means the difference between any two successive scores on the NCE scale has the same meaning throughout the scale. NCEs are useful in making comparisons between different achievement tests and for statistical computations - for example, determining an average score for a group of students. NCE scores typically range from 1 to 99 (with a median of 50). However, NCEs calculated by DESE to standardize MPI and scaled scores used to determine group (progress metric) and individual student (growth metric) improvement over time include negative numbers, which is unconventional. For example, SSD students scoring at the floor level on the grade 3-8 MAP received NCE scores as low as -64.

Appendix A

Explanation of MSIP 5/APR Achievement Measures and Scoring Guidelines (excerpted from the *Comprehensive Guide the Missouri School Improvement Program*, September 2015 update)

Status Metric

Status is a measurement of the school's or LEA's level of achievement based upon a three (3) year average of the MAP Performance Index (MPI), unless three (3) years of data are not available. The MPI is used to determine whether the LEA, school, or subgroup is meeting the 2020 target, is on track, is approaching, or is substantially not meeting (floor) the academic achievement target for English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies MAP assessments. See page 14 of the MSIP guide for Status levels and targets.

Progress Metric

The method of calculating Progress varies by content area. In science and social studies, the Progress calculation measures improvement by comparing two (2) year averages of data and setting targets based on an MPI Gap. In English language arts and mathematics, the Progress calculation measures improvement by comparing two (2) year averages of data and setting targets based on a Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) gap. Differentiated improvement targets are set for LEAs, schools and subgroups based on the individual group's two (2) prior years' achievement. See pp. 14-23 of the MSIP guide for Progress levels and targets.

Growth Metric

Growth is the change in achievement scores for an individual student between two (2) or more points in time. While Progress measures the change in the performance of a defined group over time, Growth measures the achievement gains of individual students over time. Growth measures for MSIP 5 are determined by conducting a statistical analysis of all valid MAP score pairs from the prior three (3) years. A valid MAP score pair is a score from grades 4 through 8 with a score from the prior year and grade level.

The statistical analyses determine the relationship between outcome scores and predictor scores across all schools and districts. This relationship is used to calculate a "predicted outcome score" for each score pair. The differences between the predicted outcome scores and the observed outcome scores (the "residuals") from all the analyzed score pairs are then analyzed to determine each LEA or school "effect" on student achievement growth. A score pair is assigned to an LEA and school when the MAP test that generated the outcome score was taken in that LEA and school, regardless of the LEA and school where the exam that generated the valid predictor score was taken. An LEA or school growth measure (an "effect estimate") is the average of the differences between observed and predicted scores from all test pairs assigned to the school or district.

At this time, growth measures are only available for grades 4 through 8 in English language arts and mathematics. School and LEA growth measures are reported in Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) units on the APR. The state mean is, by construction, a score of 50 NCEs. LEA and school growth measures are compared to the state mean and those that are statistically different from the state mean will be noted. (Statistical significance depends on three (3) factors – the magnitude of the difference from the state mean, the number of score pairs analyzed for the LEA or school, and the overall variability in the individual student growth measures.)