



**Coordinators**

Paul Bauer, Associate Superintendent  
Matthew Traughber, Evaluation and Research Administrator

**Table of Contents**

Executive Summary ..... 2

Report Description ..... 3

Previous Recommendations ..... 4

Results

    APR Summary ..... 5

    Standard 1: Academic Achievement..... 6

    Standard 2: Subgroup Achievement..... 8

    Standard 3: College and Career Readiness .....9

    Standard 4: Attendance ..... 10

    Standard 5: Graduation Rate..... 10

    Individual School APR ..... 11

Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement..... 12

Recommendations for Action.....12

Dissemination Plan ..... 12

Appendix A: Changes in the Calculation of the 2017 APR..... 13

Appendix B: MSIP 5 Standard Descriptions ..... 15

## Executive Summary

This report informs the Board of Education and other District stakeholders of the results and implications of the prior year's Missouri School Improvement Program 5 (MSIP 5) accreditation rating. The district Annual Performance Report (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. SSD's APR rating is based on outcomes for students who attend SSD schools and programs only. Students participating full time in career technical education (CTE) programs are included. Students provided special education services through SSD's partner districts or who attend a CTE program part time are not included with the exception of attendance rates for part-time CTE students.

## Key Conclusions

- SSD earned "Accredited" status based on results from the 2016-17 school year, achieving 75% of available APR points.
- SSD's 2017 APR score falls below the state average for K-12 districts, and in the lower third among St. Louis County districts.
- Were the "hold harmless" factor for achievement performance in English Language Arts (ELA) and math not in place, SSD would have earned 62.9% of possible APR points in 2017, which falls below the minimal score required for full accreditation of 70% (districts that score between 50% and 70% are considered provisionally accredited).
- Most of SSD's APR points awarded in the Achievement standard were based on individual student growth. The largest percentage of points was received in the content areas of math and social studies.
- SSD earned 77% of available points for the College and Career Readiness standard and 100% of available points for the Graduation Rate standard.
- The District earned APR points in the Attendance standard for the first time in recent history in 2017.
- Total calculated points for secondary schools were unavailable due to End-of-Course (EOC) exclusions. Among SSD elementary schools, three of four experienced a decrease in percent of total available points earned.

## Description

This report informs the Board of Education and other District stakeholders of the results and implications of the prior year's Missouri School Improvement Program 5 (MSIP 5) accreditation rating. SSD's Annual Performance Report (APR) rating is based on outcomes for students who attend SSD schools and programs only. Students participating full time in career technical education (CTE) programs are included. Students provided special education services through SSD's partner districts or who attend a CTE program part time are not included with the exception of attendance rates for part-time CTE students.

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 each school district in the state. 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). **Appendix B** contains detailed descriptions of APR measures and scoring guidelines.

Reporting and analysis of SSD performance on the annual APR 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.

Annual summaries of state assessment results and the APR are reported to the Board of Education in order to support fulfillment of the MSIP 5 resource and process provisions related to continuous improvement and program effectiveness monitoring, including but not limited to the following:

- The board annually reviews performance data disaggregated based on race/ethnicity, gender, identified disability, migrant, and/or LEP students in order to effectively monitor student academic achievement and dropout/persistence-to-graduation rates.
- The local board of education and district leadership promote the achievement and success of all students by monitoring and continuously improving all programs and services that support the mission and vision of the district.

This data report supports CSIP Goal Area 1 (Develop and enhance quality instructional programs to improve performance and enable students to meet their personal, academic and career goals).

Several unique characteristics of the District should be taken into consideration when interpreting and drawing conclusions pertaining to APR results:

- SSD serves a much higher number of students with disabilities as a proportion of overall enrollment than do other districts. Special education students served by SSD commonly possess significant disabilities and present with extensive educational needs. Students are referred to SSD schools only after partner district schools' efforts to address their needs prove unsuccessful. SSD also serves students with significant medical and social-emotional-behavioral needs that often impact consistent attendance.
- A goal of educators in SSD special education schools is to return students to less restrictive settings when possible. Thus students receiving special education through SSD schools who are performing best/show the most significant improvements in many cases transition back to partner districts/less restrictive settings.
- Unlike typical districts, the academic achievement of over half of SSD students is assessed via the alternative MAP assessment, the format of which changed in 2015 for ELA and math, and in 2016 for science. Initial results under the new assessments indicate that only a small percentage of students with more significant cognitive impairments (e.g., students that commonly attend an SSD school) have achieved proficient scores on these assessments based on the current performance criteria.

- Current MSIP 5 accountability standards such as graduation and post-secondary outcomes are often discordant with what would be considered acceptable outcomes for many of SSD’s students with significant disabilities.
- A sizable percentage of SSD students attend the district’s career and technical education schools. The path to a CTE school is unconventional, however, with most students first enrolling as 11<sup>th</sup> graders. SSD is thus accountable for the achievement and outcomes of these students despite having minimal influence on instruction and programming for those students prior to 11<sup>th</sup> grade.

## Recommendations From Most Recent Data Report

Recommendation 1: Dialogue with DESE regarding the impact of achievement assessment changes and requirements on SSD’s accreditation status, highlighting structural challenges to accreditation under the current formula that are unique to SSD and highlighted in this report. Continue to study the validity of utilizing the new MAP-A to categorize the achievement of students who have significant cognitive and communication delays.

Status of Recommendation: SSD administrators have engaged in ongoing discussions with DESE regarding an accountability plan for the District. The District completed the development of formative assessment measures for students with significant cognitive disabilities (termed “Essential Elements Checklists”) for all grade levels in the content areas of ELA, math, and science in spring of 2017. Teachers began utilizing these assessments in fall of 2017.

Recommendation 2: Identify effective practices in place at schools that have been more successful in meeting MSIP 5 requirements for potential adoption/adaptation at less successful schools. Analyze specific areas of poor performance at individual schools and provide targeted supports to drive improvement.

Status of Recommendation: Ongoing review of effective and ineffective practices in SSD buildings is occurring. Certain practices (for example the use of I-Ready reading and math assessments) have been expanded based on their positive impact on student outcomes.

Recommendation 3: Continue to monitor and implement strategies to improve student attendance.

Status of Recommendation: School and District administrators analyze attendance data regularly. Programmatic changes and supports (for example, providing additional transportation options and frequent attendance reminders for parents and families) are implemented on the basis of factors believed to contribute to trends that fall below expectations.

## Current Results

### APR Summary

**Performance/Effectiveness Question(s) These Data Inform:** *What proportion of accreditation points did SSD earn? How did the most recent year APR performance compare with that of past years? In which standards has SSD been successful or unsuccessful in earning APR points? How does SSD performance compare to that of other local districts and the state as a whole?*

Districts in Missouri are assigned to one of four accreditation status levels based on the proportion of APR points earned:

**Accredited with Distinction:** A district earned a minimum of 90% or more of the APR points possible and meets other criteria as established by the State Board of Education.

**Accredited:** A district earned 70% or more of the APR points possible.

**Provisionally Accredited:** A district earned 50% or more of the APR points possible.

**Unaccredited:** A district earned less than 50% of the APR points possible.

Note that a “hold harmless” provision (also in place the two previous years) allows districts to use the highest APR point total over three years for ELA and math achievement results (see **Appendix A**). The hold harmless provision was maintained in 2017 due to a testing irregularity that invalidated the results of English II and Algebra I End-of-Course (EOC) exams.

SSD remained fully accredited in 2017, earning **75.0%** of all possible APR points. Points earned in the Achievement standard areas decreased in 2017. In contrast, College and Career Readiness points increased. SSD earned 100% of available points in the Graduation Rate standard for the second consecutive year, including points for the 6-year graduation rate. The district earned APR points in the Attendance standard for the first time in in the last five years.

SSD’s APR scores over five years appear in the table below. Point totals/percentages that were higher than the prior year are highlighted in **green**, totals that were lower than the prior year are highlighted in **orange**, and totals that remained the same as in the prior year are highlighted in **blue**. For achievement standards in years 2016 and 2017, points that *would have been earned* in absence of hold harmless agreements are shown in parentheses.

### APR Summary

APR Standard	Total Points Possible	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017	
		Points	% of Points	Points	% of Points	Points	% of Points	Points	% of Points	Points	% of Points
1. Academic Achievement	56	48.0	85.7%	54.0	96.4%	53.0	94.6%	47.5 (40.0)	84.8% (71.4%)	40.0 (26.0)	71.4% (46.4%)
2. Subgroup Achievement	14	12.0	85.7%	13.5	96.4%	13.0	92.9%	11.5 (8.5)	82.1% (60.7%)	10.0 (7.0)	71.4% (50%)
3. College and Career Ready (CCR)	30	10.0	33.3%	18.0	60.0%	23.5	78.3%	21.0	70.0%	23.0	76.7%
4. Attendance	10	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	2.0	20.0%
5. Graduation Rate	30	22.5	75.0%	18.0	60.0%	30.0	100%	30.0	100%	30.0	100%
<b>APR Total Points</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>92.5</b>	<b>66.1%</b>	<b>103.5</b>	<b>73.9%</b>	<b>119.5</b>	<b>85.4%</b>	<b>110.0</b> (99.5)	<b>78.6%</b> (71.1%)	<b>105</b> (88)	<b>75.0%</b> (62.9%)

Note: **Green** shading = higher scores than the prior year; **orange** shading = lower scores than achieved the prior year; **blue** shading = scores that remained the same as in the prior year. For 2016 and 2017, points that *would have been earned* in absence of the hold harmless provision are shown in parentheses.

2016 and 2017 APR percentages for St. Louis County Districts are displayed at right (sorted top to bottom by 2017 percentage).

SSD’s APR percentage for 2017 ranked below the state average for K-12 districts and in the lower third among St. Louis County Districts. Two of SSD’s partner districts, Normandy and Ferguson-Florissant, scored below the accredited range. The average APR percentage among Missouri K-12 districts in 2016 was 91.1% (up from 89.6% in 2015).

District	Percent of APR Points Earned 2016	Percent of APR Points Earned 2017
Pattonville	94.6%	100.0%
Brentwood	100.0%	99.3%
Ladue	98.9%	98.9%
Clayton	98.6%	98.6%
Kirkwood	99.3%	98.6%
Parkway	98.2%	98.6%
Rockwood	98.2%	98.6%
Valley Park	98.6%	98.6%
Lindbergh	98.9%	98.2%
Maplewood-Richmond Heights	96.1%	97.5%
Webster Groves	97.5%	97.5%
Affton	96.8%	96.4%
Bayless	97.9%	96.1%
Hancock Place	91.4%	95.4%
Mehlville	91.4%	92.1%
<b>STATE-WIDE AVERAGE (K-12)</b>	<b>89.6%</b>	<b>91.1%</b>
Hazelwood	86.1%	85.0%
Jennings	80.4%	80.4%
Ritenour	71.4%	77.9%
<b>SSD</b>	<b>78.6%</b>	<b>75.0%</b>
Riverview Gardens	74.6%	70.7%
University City	72.5%	70.0%
Ferguson-Florissant	70.4%	67.1%
Normandy	54.6%	62.5%

## Standard 1: Academic Achievement

**Performance and Effectiveness Question(s) These Data Inform:** *To what extent is SSD meeting state achievement targets? How has SSD’s MAP Percentage Index (MPI) changed over time? How have changes to state testing procedures and assessments impacted SSD’s accreditation standing?*

Detailed Standard 1 results appear in the table below. To reiterate, a hold harmless provision allows schools to use the highest APR point total over three years for ELA and math achievement results (see **Appendix A**). The hold harmless provision was maintained in 2017 due to a testing irregularity that invalidated the results of English II and Algebra I EOC exams. As such, the 2017 MAP Percentage Indexes (MPI)<sup>1</sup> reported below exclude high school English and Algebra EOCs from the calculation.

SSD’s 3-year status classification fell at the “Floor” level in ELA, math, and science, and at the “Approaching” level for social studies in 2017. Three-year average MPI decreased in all content areas with the exception of social studies. However one-year increases were observed in both social studies and math. SSD would have earned 14 fewer APR points in Standard 1 had the hold harmless provision not been in effect. Lower MPI scores have coincided with the introduction of the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) as the MAP-Alternative (MAP-A) assessment.

<sup>1</sup> 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: (Sum of Student Achievement Scores/Number of Students)\*100. The minimum MSIP/MAP Index Score is 100, and the maximum score is 500. The current MSIP 5 formula “penalizes” Below Basic scores. Per the MSIP 5 user guide, “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.”

All 2017 APR points in ELA and math were earned on the basis of individual growth among students who take the grade-level MAP (grades 4-8). In social studies, both status and progress points were earned. Note that social studies results are based entirely on the Government EOC. See the State Assessment Results Data Report issued in December of 2017 for an in-depth review of state assessment performance and trends.

**Standard 1 (Academic Achievement) Results**

	APR Points Possible	APR Points 2013	APR Points 2014	APR Points 2015	APR Points 2016	3 year Avg/2016 Classification	APR Points 2017	3 year Avg/2017 Classification
<b>English Language Arts</b>								
MPI		377.7	373.7	240.9	231.9	282.2	204.0	225.6
Status	16.0	12.0	12.0	9.0	0.0	Floor	0.0	Floor
Progress	12.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Floor	0.0	Floor
Growth	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	Exceeding	6.0	On Track
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress or Growth)	16.0	16.0	16.0	<b>16.0</b>	12.0		6.0	
<b>Mathematics</b>								
MPI		369.9	359.1	166.5	167.4	231.0	174.8	169.6
Status	16.0	12.0	12.0	0.0	0.0	Floor	0.0	Floor
Progress	12.0	12.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Floor	0.0	Floor
Growth	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	Exceeding	12.0	Exceeding
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress or Growth)	16.0	16.0	<b>16.0</b>	12.0	12.0		12.0	
<b>Science</b>								
MPI		386.2	359.8	364.2	229.5	317.8	220.1	271.3
Status	16.0	16.0	16.0	16.0	9.0	Approaching	0.0	Floor
Progress	12.0	12.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	Floor	0.0	Floor
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress)	16.0	16.0	16.0	16.0	9.0		0.0	
<b>Social Studies</b>								
MPI		n/a	324.4	300.0	330.6	318.3	341.3	324.0
Status	8.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	Approaching	5.0	Approaching
Progress	6.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	1.5	Approaching	6.0	Exceeding
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress)	8.0	0.0	6.0	5.0	6.5		8.0	

Note. **Green** shading = higher scores than the prior year; **orange** shading = lower scores than achieved the prior year; **blue** shading = scores that remained the same as in the prior year. Prior years' Total Point scores used to calculate the 2016 APR under the hold harmless exception are bolded.

## Standard 2: Subgroup Achievement

**Performance and Effectiveness Question(s) These Data Inform:** *To what extent are students that comprise a subgroup meeting accreditation standards and improving year to year?*

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, and thus APR trends in Standard 2 generally mirror overall district achievement trends for Standard 1. See results in the table below. SSD would have earned 3 fewer APR points in the area of subgroup achievement were the hold harmless agreement not in place for 2017.

### Standard 2 (Subgroup Achievement) APR Results

	APR Points Possible	APR Points 2013	APR Points 2014	APR Points 2015	APR Points 2016	3 year Avg/2016 Classification	APR Points 2017	3 year Avg/2017 Classification
<b>English Language Arts</b>								
MPI		377.2	373.1	240.3	231.1	281.5	204.0	225.1
Status	4.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	0.0	Floor	0.0	Floor
Progress	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Floor	0.0	Floor
Growth	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	On Track	2.0	On Track
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress or Growth)	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	2.0		2.0	
<b>Mathematics</b>								
MPI		369.9	359.4	166.2	167.1	230.9	174.8	169.4
Status	4.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	Floor	0.0	Floor
Progress	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Floor	0.0	Floor
Growth	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	Exceeding	3.0	Exceeding
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress or Growth)	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	3.0	3.0		3.0	
<b>Science</b>								
MPI		385.4	358.8	364.1	227.1	316.7	220.1	270.4
Status	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	Approaching	0.0	Floor
Progress	3.0	3.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	Floor	0.0	Floor
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress)	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	2.0		0.0	
<b>Social Studies</b>								
MPI		n/a	321.5	298.0	328.2	315.9	341.3	322.5
Status	2.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	Approaching	1.5	On Track
Progress	1.5	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.5	Approaching	1.5	Exceeding
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress)	2.0	0.0	1.5	1.0	1.5		2.0	

Note. **Green** shading = higher scores than the prior year; **orange** shading = lower scores than achieved the prior year; **blue** shading = scores that remained the same as in the prior year. Prior years' Total Point scores used to calculate the 2016 APR under the hold harmless exception are bolded.



### Standard 3: College and Career Readiness

**Performance and Effectiveness Question(s) These Data Inform:** How are SSD students performing on college and career readiness assessments such as the ACT and WorkKeys? To what extent does SSD meet DESE targets for students demonstrating proficiency in advanced coursework? How do SSD’s post-secondary placement results compare to state expectations?

SSD earned 23 of a possible 30 points in the College and Career Readiness standard, exceeding the 2016 total by 2 points. The 2-point difference can be attributed to the achievement of “CTE Expansion” points in 2017; otherwise, points earned in 2016 and 2017 were identical. Three-year averages increased for Indicators 1-3 (CCR Assessments) and Indicator 4 (Advanced Placement); the 3-year average decreased for Indicators 5-6 (Postsecondary Placement). Points SSD earns in the Advanced Placement area generally come from CTE students who take and pass a Technical Skills Assessment (TSA) or Industry Recognized Credential (IRC). A description of the performance indicators that contribute to Standard 3 can be found in **Appendix B**.

#### Standard 3 (College and Career Readiness) APR Results

	APR Points Possible	APR Points 2013	APR Points 2014	APR Points 2015	APR Points 2016	3 year Avg/2016 Classification	APR Points 2017	3 year Avg/2017 Classification
<b>1-3 CCR Assessments</b>								
<b>% at or Above State Standard</b>		32.6%	41.1%	49.7%	46.3%	45.6%	50.3%	48.5%
Status	10.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	6.0	Approaching	6.0	Approaching
Progress	7.5	0.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	Floor	0.0	Floor
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress)	10.0	0.0	2.0	8.0	6.0		6.0	
<b>4 Advanced Placement</b>								
<b>% at or Above State Standard</b>		32.2%	41.8%	50.2%	40.3%	44.0%	49.4%	46.4%
Status	10.0	6.0	6.0	7.5	7.5	On Track	7.5	On Track
Progress	7.5	7.5	4.0	2.0	0.0	Floor	0.0	Floor
CTE Expansion	2.0	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.0	n/a	2.0	
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress)	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.5	7.5		9.5	
<b>5-6 Postsecondary Placement</b>								
<b>% Earning Qualifying Score</b>		83.5%	85.2%	68.5%	85.0%	85.0%	76.9%	82.3%
Status	10.0	0.0	6.0	6.0	7.5	On Track	7.5	On Track
Progress	7.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Floor	0.0	Floor
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress)	10.0	0.0	6.0	6.0	7.5		7.5	

Note. **Green** shading = higher scores than the prior year; **orange** shading = lower scores than achieved the prior year; **blue** shading = scores that remained the same as in the prior year.

## Standard 4: Attendance

**Performance and Effectiveness Question(s) These Data Inform:** How do SSD student attendance rates compare to state targets?

SSD earned APR points in the Attendance standard for the first time in five years in 2017. The 2 points earned were based on progress. SSD's 3-year classification for Attendance again fell at the Floor level. The rate of proportional attendance at or above 90% was essentially the same in 2016 and 2017.

### Standard 4 (Attendance) APR Results

	APR Points Possible	APR Points 2013	APR Points 2014	APR Points 2015	APR Points 2016	3 year Avg/2016 Classification	APR Points 2017	3 year Avg/2017 Classification
<b>Attendance</b>								
<b>% Above 90%</b>		78.9%	78.0%	73.4%	75.8%	75.7%	75.9%	75.0%
Status	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Floor	0.0	Floor
Progress	7.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Floor	2.0	Approaching
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress)	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		2.0	

Note. **Green** shading = higher scores than the prior year; **orange** shading = lower scores than achieved the prior year; **blue** shading = scores that remained the same as in the prior year.

## Standard 5: Graduation Rate

**Performance and Effectiveness Question(s) These Data Inform:** What percent of cohorts are graduating after 4, 5, 6, and 7 years? How do SSD's graduation rates compare to DESE targets?

SSD earned all 30 available points for the Graduation Rate standard. This performance is attributable to the 6-year and 7-year graduation rate indicators. The 6-year graduation rate in 2017 exceeded that of recent prior years. The 4-year graduation rate decreased in 2017.

### Standard 5 (Graduation Rate) APR Results

	APR Points Possible	APR Points 2013	APR Points 2014	APR Points 2015	APR Points 2016	3 year Avg/2016 Classification	APR Points 2017	3 year Avg/2017 Classification
<b>Four-Year Graduation Rate</b>								
<b>4-Yr Rate</b>		69.5%	63.5%	73.0%*	72.4%	69.6%	56.4%	67.5%
Status	30	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	Floor	0.0	Floor
Progress	22.5	22.5	6.0	0	6.0	Approaching	0.0	Floor
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress)	30.0	22.5	6.0	0	6.0		0.0	
<b>Five-Year Graduation Rate</b>								
<b>5-Yr Rate</b>		58.0%	62.9%	59.7%*	68.1%	63.6%	64.3%	64.0%
Status	30	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	Floor	0.0	Floor
Progress	22.5	6.0	6.0	0	0.0	Floor	0.0	Floor
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress)	30.0	6.0	6.0	0	0.0		0.0	

<b>Six-Year Graduation Rate</b>								
<b>6-Yr Rate</b>		61.7%	66.4%	71.2%*	68.3%	68.6%	80.3%	73.4%
Status	30	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	Floor	18	Approaching
Progress	22.5	0.0	6.0	6	0.0	Floor	12	On Track
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress)	30.0	0.0	6.0	6	0.0		30.0	
<b>Seven-Year Graduation Rate</b>								
<b>7-Yr Rate</b>		n/a	80.3%	84.8%*	88.9%	84.7%	84.4%	86.0%
Status	30	n/a	18.0	22.5	22.5	On Track	22.5	On Track
Progress	22.5	n/a	0.0	22.5	22.5	Exceeding	0	Floor
Total Points Earned (Status + Progress)	30.0	n/a	18.0	30.0	30.0		22.5	

Note. **Green** shading = higher scores than the prior year; **orange** shading = lower scores than achieved the prior year; **blue** shading = scores that remained the same as in the prior year. \*Rates across 4 through 7 year cohorts were reported slightly differently in the 2015 APR as 72.6%, 59.3%, 71.1%, and 84.9%, respectively.

## Individual School APR

*Performance and Effectiveness Question(s) These Data Inform: To what extent are individual SSD schools meeting accreditation expectations?*

The table below displays APR results for individual SSD schools. Given the 2017 EOC invalidations discussed previously, a Total APR could not be calculated for individual high schools (with the exception of South Technical<sup>2</sup>) due to incomplete achievement and subgroup achievement standard results (points were not calculated for any building where Algebra I or English II EOCs exceeded 15% of the assessments taken). Each of the three SSD elementary schools earned 57% of the APR points available.

### APR Performance for Individual SSD Schools

School Name	Total APR Points Possible 2016	Total APR Points Earned 2016	% of Possible APR Points Earned 2016	Total APR Points Possible 2017	Total APR Points Earned 2017	% of Possible APR Points Earned 2017
Ackerman Elementary	70.0	51.0	72.9%	70.0	40.0	57.1%
Litzsinger Elementary	70.0	51.0	72.9%	70.0	40.0	57.1%
Neuwoehner High School	138.0	84.0	60.9%	138.0	Not calculated	n/a
North Technical High School	140.0	112.0	80.0%	140.0	Not calculated	n/a
Northview High School	140.0	78.0	55.7%	140.0	Not calculated	n/a
South Technical High School	40.0	6.0	15.0%	40.0	10.0	25.0%
Southview Elementary	70.0	40.0	57.1%	70.0	40.0	57.1%
Southview High	128.0	63.5	49.6%	118.0	Not calculated	n/a

<sup>2</sup> The South Technical High School APR percentage includes 30 possible points for Standard 5 Graduation Rate, even though all students are part-time and none are considered to be graduates of SSD. Thus the percent of points earned is misleading. The school earned 10 of 10 possible points in attendance for 2017.

## Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement

### Strengths:

- SSD achieved an APR score that classifies the District as accredited.
- SSD earned individual student Growth points in ELA and math under Standard 1 Achievement.
- APR point increases were observed in the achievement content areas of math and social studies.
- SSD earned 77% of possible points in the College and Career Readiness standard. Two points were earned based on the CTE Expansion criterion element in 2017.
- SSD was awarded points in the Attendance standard (based on progress) for the first time in five years.
- SSD earned all possible APR points for Graduation Rate. The 6-year graduation rate improved in 2017.

### Opportunities for Improvement:

- SSD's 2017 APR score falls below the state average for K-12 districts, and in the lower third among St. Louis County districts.
- The District received fewer points under the Academic Achievement standards in 2017. APR points decreased in the achievement areas of ELA and science.
- Were the hold harmless exemption for achievement performance in ELA and math not in place, SSD would have earned 62.9% of possible APR points in 2017, which falls below the minimal score required for full accreditation of 70% (districts that score between 50% and 70% are considered provisionally accredited).
- The District's post-secondary placement percentage decreased in 2017.
- The District continues to struggle to meet DESE targets for student attendance.
- Total building points for secondary schools were unavailable due to End-of-Course (EOC) exclusions. Among SSD elementary schools, three of four experienced a decrease in percent of total available points earned.

## Recommendations For Action

Continue dialogue with DESE regarding equitable accreditation requirements for SSD given the nature of the district and the students it serves.

## Dissemination Plan

Evaluation and Research staff will distribute this report via email to SSD building and program administrators. The report will be posted on the District website and on the intra-district SSD Life site.

## **Appendix A**

### **Changes in the Calculation of the 2017 APR**

#### **English Language Arts and Mathematics Assessment Hold Harmless**

The 2017 APR will be calculated using existing 2015 and 2016 data plus 2017 data with A1 and E2 removed. The points earned in Standard 1 and 2 will be compared to the points earned in 2016. The district will receive the higher of 2016 or 2017 points for the APR. The same calculation process will be followed for Standard 1 Academic Achievement and Standard 2 Subgroup Achievement

#### **Calculation of Progress and Use of Normal Curve Equivalents (NCE)**

The 2017 APR will be calculated using existing 2015 and 2016 data plus 2017 data with A1 and E2 removed. DESE will use normal curve equivalents in the calculation of progress for ELA and mathematics. This statistical method, which measures student achievement along a normal curve, will be used in order to preserve the progress calculation throughout the transition in assessments. (Note: This policy does not apply to science and social studies within Standards 1 and 2, nor does it apply to Standards 3, 4, and 5. Progress within these standards will be calculated in the same manner as in years past and will include 2017 data.)

#### **Removal of Optional EOC Assessments**

DESE has not included optional EOC assessments in prior year data to allow for equitable comparison and opportunity for progress. Optional EOCs include all EOC assessments beyond the four required (English II, American Government, Biology, and Algebra I, or if Algebra I taken prior to 9th grade, Algebra II). When excluding this data, DESE will not alter any prior year final APR totals. The adjusted data will only factor into the calculation of the 2015, 2016, and 2017 APR. Further, DESE does not penalize any LEA for a Level Not Determined (LND) designation that is created by the removal of optional EOCs from prior year data. However, the LND designation will not be modified for 2015 and 2016 data.

#### **Community Eligibility Provision (CEP)**

The implementation of the Community Eligibility Provision (CEP) will alter the method of calculating Standard 2: Subgroup Achievement for LEAs that elect to participate. These LEAs will no longer be collecting paperwork for students who are eligible for Free/Reduced Lunch (FRL), and as such, DESE will follow Federal guidance in accounting for CEP LEAs' subgroup populations. While participating in CEP, the LEA's super subgroup will be the same as the "all students" group. Missouri will continue to report data for students in the aggregate, as well as for the following subgroups: low-income students, students with disabilities, English learners (EL), and the state's major racial and ethnic populations.

#### **Census Administration of the ACT for Grade 11 Students**

As part of the Missouri Assessment Program, all students will receive the opportunity to produce a valid ACT score that can be used when applying to institutions of higher education. From an accountability perspective, DESE will report and weigh this newly collected data in the following manner:

- i. All grade 11 students who participate in the census administration will meet the participation requirement of Standard 3\*1-3, earning at least 0.25 student weight upon graduation.
- ii. The 11th grade census ACT administration will produce two reportable items, a participation rate and an average composite score, that appear on the APR Summary Data page and the District Report Card.
- iii. When calculating the participation rate, the group of total will be composed of all grade 11 students minus any MAP-Alternate students and any EL students who have resided within the United States for less than a year.

#### **Expansion of Career and Technical Education (CTE)**

For the 2017 APR, DESE will award additional points under Standard 3\*4: College and Career Readiness for schools that create CTE opportunities. An LEA may receive two points toward the ten points possible in Standard 3\*4 by creating and/or entering into a partnership with area career centers, comprehensive high schools, industry, or business to develop a pathway for students to accomplish each of the following:

- i. Enroll in a program of career and technical education while in high school;
- ii. Participate and complete an internship or apprenticeship during their final year of high school;

iii. Obtain the industry certification or credentials applicable to their program or career and technical education and internship or apprenticeship.

LEAs that provide for all three of the above objectives will receive the aforementioned two points under Standard 3\*4. In order for LEAs to maintain these two points in consecutive years, the LEA must continue to expand their CTE program offerings each year, by continuing to grow the previously expanded program, expanding a separate program, or creating a new program in compliance with the stated criteria. Additionally, all LEAs that partner with an area career center or vocational school that has expanded or created CTE opportunities in alignment with the stated criteria will be eligible for the two additional points. Only programs whose application gained departmental approval will receive additional points on the 2017 APR.

#### **New SAT® Assessment**

Update: As of March 2016, the College Board began administering a new version of the SAT®.

Additional changes may be found on pages 10-12 of the 2017 MSIP 5 Comprehensive Guide at [https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/MSIP\\_5\\_2017\\_Comprehensive\\_Guide.pdf](https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/MSIP_5_2017_Comprehensive_Guide.pdf)

## Appendix B

### MSIP 5 Standard Descriptions

#### MSIP 5 Standard 1: Academic Achievement

*Explanation of MSIP 5/APR Achievement Measures and Scoring Guidelines (excerpted from the Comprehensive Guide the Missouri School Improvement Program, October 2017 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 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.)

#### 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.

### **MSIP 5 Standard 3: College and Career Readiness (CCR)**

#### **Indicators 1-3: The district provides adequate post-secondary preparation for all students.**

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 district's average composite score(s) on any department-approved measure(s) of college and career readiness, for example, the ACT®, SAT®, COMPASS®, or ASVAB.
3. The percent of graduates who participated in any department-approved measure(s) of college and career readiness, for example, the ACT®, SAT®, COMPASS®, or ASVAB.

#### **Indicator 4: The district provides adequate post-secondary preparation for all students.**

4. The percent of graduates who earned a qualifying score on an Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), or Technical Skills Attainment (TSA) assessments and/or receive college credit through early college, dual enrollment, or approved dual credit courses meets or exceeds the state standard or demonstrates required improvement.

#### **Indicators 5-6: The district provides adequate post-secondary preparation for all students.**

5. The percent of graduates who attend post-secondary education/training or are in the military within six (6) months of graduating meets the state standard or demonstrates required improvement.
6. 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 meets the state standard or demonstrates required improvement.

### **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.

### **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).