



Coordinators

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

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 2

Report Description 3

Previous Recommendations 4

Results

 Data/Reporting Element 1: Achievement Level Results Overall and by School..... 5

 Data/Reporting Element 2: Achievement Results by Test Type 7

 Data/Reporting Element 3: Demographic Comparisons 8

 Data/Reporting Element 4: Student Growth..... 10

Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement 12

Recommendations for Action 12

Dissemination Plan 12

Notes..... 13

Appendix A: Reportable Score Counts 14

Executive Summary

This report summarizes state accountability assessment results and trends for the 2016-17 school year. A subsequent Annual Performance Review (APR) report will analyze Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) and APR indicator results comprehensively.

The State Assessment Results report analyzes the performance of the District based on the academic assessment component of the MSIP accountability framework. Reporting and analysis of SSD student performance on state accountability assessments 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.

Key Conclusions

- Consecutive years with a consistent test format allowed for comparison of performance across two to three years of results, depending on the test format.
- Due to a test validity issue, DESE chose to withhold results for the 2016-17 Algebra I and English II high school EOC exams.
- Both positive and concerning performance trends were observed. For example, the proportion of students scoring in the below basic range on the grade level MAP test declined over 3 years. In contrast, proficiency rates in math remain low, and the percentage of students who took the MAP-A format test and scored in the below basic range remained high.
- Over several years, students attending Ackerman Elementary have achieved proficient and advanced assessment results at higher rates than students attending other SSD public separate schools.
- With several exceptions, racial- and socio-economic status-based discrepancies in performance among students attending SSD schools are modest if observed at all. In some cases African-American students achieved proficient scores at higher rates than white students. Students who received Free and Reduced Lunch (through individual or entire school eligibility) consistently performed better than students who were not eligible to receive Free and Reduced Lunch.
- DESE calculates a standardized measure of growth for students in grades 4-8 who take the grade-level MAP. Individual student growth relative to predicted performance improved in 2017. In reference to past/predicted performance, on average, students demonstrated fairly strong growth in math and relatively typical growth in ELA.

Description

This report summarizes state accountability assessment results and trends for the 2016-17 school year based on data files obtained from the Missouri DESE online Comprehensive Data System. The State Assessment Results report analyzes the performance of individual schools and the District as a whole based on the academic assessment component of the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) accountability framework. Reporting and analysis of SSD student performance on state accountability assessments allows for identification of District trends, accomplishments, and opportunities for improvement.

Students whose state assessment results are accountable include those that take the grade-level MAP at grades 3-8; those that take the MAP-Alternative (MAP-A) assessments at grades 3-8 and 11¹; and secondary students who take a required End-of-Course (EOC) exam. The required EOCs include English II (English Language Arts), Algebra I or Algebra II (math), Biology (science), and Government (social studies). The point in time a particular EOC is taken during high school (or in some cases middle school) is dictated by when the associated course is taken. Thus North Technical High generally has few students taking the Algebra I EOC, as most secondary students take that course and exam during their 8th or 9th grade year. However, scores from Algebra I and English II EOCs taken in 2016-17 were deemed invalid by DESE based on the failure to establish “year-to-year comparable results.”² Thus DESE plans not to release statewide results from these assessments, and the 2017 district APR calculations will exclude them.

Students in grades 3-8 who take the grade-level MAP completed new assessments in the areas of English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics starting in the 2015-16 school year. Thus grade-level MAP results from 2016 and 2017 are directly comparable. However a new grade-level test is scheduled to be completed during the 2017-18 school year. Use of the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM)³ as the alternative assessment in the content areas of ELA and math was initiated in 2014-15. Use of the DLM as the MAP-A for science was introduced in 2015-16.

Annual summaries of state assessment results and the APR are reported to the Board of Education in order to support fulfillment of the MSIP⁵ 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.

CSIP Strategies relevant to this report:

CSIP Strategy 1.1 Improve the quality of instruction in literacy for all students.

CSIP Strategy 1.2 Improve the quality of instruction in numeracy for all students.

CSIP Strategy 1.3 Improve development of communication skills to increase academic achievement, social-communication and positive post-secondary outcomes.

CSIP Strategy 1.9 Increase the utilization and quality implementation of standards-based goal setting in individualized education plans.

CSIP Strategy 1.10 Increase skilled utilization of student assessments in the areas of literacy and numeracy.

Recommendations From Most Recent Data Report

Recommendation 1: Continue to scrutinize the use of the DLM as the alternative accountability assessment for schools and districts such as SSD that serve a high proportion of students with significant cognitive and communication disabilities. Continue work focused on developing formative assessments for such students.

Status of Recommendation: 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: Further explore differences in performance across schools in order to identify effective practices that might be shared or implemented more broadly, along with opportunities for improvement that might exist at individual schools.

Status of Recommendation: The I-Ready reading and math assessments are now utilized in all elementary schools.

Results

Data/Reporting Element 1: Achievement Level Results Overall and by School

Performance/Effectiveness Question(s) These Data Inform: *What proportion of students performed in the Proficient or Advanced range (i.e., the ‘top two’) on the state accountability assessments? How does the ‘top two’ proportion for SSD compare to that state-wide? How does the ‘top two’ proportion among separate schools compare to that for students with IEPs state-wide? For assessments that remained the same across annual administrations, how does performance in 2017 compare to that from prior years?*

The figure on the following page displays the proportion of ‘top two’ scores (i.e., scores falling in either the proficient or advanced range) over three years for each SSD school/program and the District overall. State-level results for 2017 were unavailable at the time of this report. Note that the count of students with reportable scores appears in Appendix A (in some cases, the number of students with reportable scores is small).

Data Summary:


- District-wide, proficiency rates were relatively similar in 2016 and 2017 for ELA, math, and social studies. The District proficiency rate in science decreased in 2017.
- Proficiency rates continue to be lowest in the content area of math, with only 10.6% of students performing in the proficient or advanced range in 2017. For most schools, 5% or less of students performed in the top two range in math. The District’s MAP Performance Index (MPI) will improve in math for 2017, however, based on a larger percentage of advanced scores and smaller percentage of below basic scores (see Data/Reporting Element 2).
- Proficiency rates are highest in social studies (note that the social studies results for SSD are based solely on the Government EOC).
- Proficiency rates differ across SSD schools. Some of this difference may be attributed to enrollment composition (e.g., if a particular school enrolls a greater percentage of students who take the MAP-A). Notable school-level trends observed include the following:
 - Among the separate schools, students attending Ackerman achieved the highest rates of proficiency by a considerable degree, across content areas (the differences between Ackerman and overall District proficiency rates in ELA and math in 2017 are significant at $p < .001$).
 - Students attending Neuwoehner performed in the proficient range in the content area of ELA at a higher percentage than other separate secondary schools (significant at $p < .05$).
 - The proportion of students performing in the top two range increased at Southview High in 2017 (the difference in math was significant at $p < .05$).
 - Litzsinger proficiency rates were lower in 2017 in comparison to the prior year (differences were not statistically significant).
 - Rates of proficiency in ELA and math remain very low at Northview (though the science proficiency rate increased in 2017), JDC, and External Sites (which includes Bridges, POS, and VSP).
 - Proficiency rates in science at social studies at North Tech were similar in 2016 and 2017. Results for English II and Algebra I EOCs are unavailable due to the validity issue discussed previously (math results shown represent students who took the Algebra II EOC).

MAP "Top Two" Percent Over 3 years, Overall and by School

Excludes non-reportable scores and both Algebra I and English II EOCs

Grade-level (3-8) and MAP-A Science assessments were new in 2016

Student counts appear in parentheses



Data/Reporting Element 2: Achievement Level Results by Test Type


Performance and Effectiveness Question(s) These Data Inform: *How did student performance on the state assessments vary by test type (grade-level MAP vs. MAP-A vs. EOC)? Does programming appear more or less effective for certain groups of students or for specific subject areas, as indicated by state test results?*

Charts below display a breakdown of student test performance by test type (grade-level MAP vs. EOC vs. MAP-A). The chart shows the percentage of students that scored at each achievement level (below basic, basic, proficient, and advanced). Counts of reportable scores for each test and content area can be found in Appendix A. Similar to the results reported above, Algebra I and English II results are excluded from 2016-17 data; thus for the most recent year there are no reportable EOC scores in the ELA content area, and the math results shown for 2016-17 are based on the scores of only four students who took the Algebra II EOC.


Data Summary:

- MAP-A results in 2016 and 2017 were comparable. A large proportion of students assessed via the MAP-A format continue to score in the below basic range. More students taking the MAP-A performed proficient, and fewer below basic, in ELA than was the case with math and science.
- The percentage of students taking the grade-level MAP test format who performed in the below basic range declined in each content area in 2017, most substantially (9 percentage points) in math (percentage difference between 2016 and 2017 was not statistically significant).
- A smaller percentage of students performed in the proficient or advanced range on the science EOC in 2017.
- Social studies EOC results were roughly the same in 2016 and 2017, though a smaller proportion scored in the below basic range in 2017.

State Test Results Over 3 Years
 Percent at each achievement level by test type
 Includes "reportable" results only



All Test Types



Data/Reporting Element 3: Demographic Comparisons

Performance and Effectiveness Question(s) These Data Inform: *To what extent was performance among white and non-white students similar or different? How did students who are designated Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) perform in comparison to students who do not receive FRL?*

Breakdowns of 2016-17 state test results by race (white vs. non-white) and FRL appear below, disaggregated by test type. Reportable score counts corresponding to these charts appear in Appendix A. These figures reflect results for all SSD schools, including special education schools/programs and North Technical High School. With respect FRL, note that students attending SSD schools other than Southview and Neuwoehner are 100% eligible for FRL through the USDA Community Eligibility Provision⁴. As a result, some students whose families would not individually qualify for the FRL program are included in the FRL group, and the results presented should be interpreted cautiously in light of that caveat.


Data Summary:

- On the grade-level MAP, white and African-American students performed fairly similarly in math, though the proportion of white students performing in the proficient range exceeded that for African-American students in ELA and science.
- Proficiency rates among African-American students on the science and social studies EOCs exceeded those of white students. Counts of students taking these EOCs were three to four times higher among African-American students.
- MAP-A test format performance was similar across African-American and white students, though African-American students scored proficient on the MAP-A ELA at a moderately higher rate than did white students.
- The proportion of students tested who were eligible for FRL substantially exceeds that of students who were not eligible for FRL (see Appendix A).
- Students eligible for FRL, as a group, consistently performed in the proficient and advanced range at higher percentages than did students who were not eligible for FRL (total differences in ELA, math, and social studies significant at $p < .01$; difference in science significant at $p < .05$). This was true across grade-level MAP, EOC, and MAP-A test formats. These results may be somewhat skewed due to 100% FRL eligibility at most SSD schools (discussed above).

2017 State Test Results by Race

Includes "reportable" results only

Race categories other than black and white were excluded due to small cell counts




Totals by Race




2017 State Test Results by Free and Reduced Lunch Status

Includes "reportable" results only



Totals by FRL Status



Data/Reporting Element 4: Student Growth

Performance and Effectiveness Question(s) These Data Inform: To what extent did individual students improve their performance on the grade-level assessment in comparison to expectations based on prior performance?

For students in grades 4-8 who take the grade-level MAP, DESE calculates a normalized score that reflects the relative position of a student's performance in relationship to others who took the test in their grade that same year. DESE also projects what each student's performance might be in a given year based on their prior years' performance and several other factors. This allows the state to estimate the extent to which an individual student performed better or worse than their "expected" score relative to same-grade peers in a given year. This metric is used to determine the "growth" points districts and schools earn on the MSIP5 Annual Performance Review. The data also allow individual districts to examine the extent to which students who take the grade-level MAP assessment make normative gains from year to year beyond that predicted based on past performance.

Average growth scores by school and overall for ELA and math, for both 2016 and 2017, are displayed in the charts below. Counts of students whose scores contributed to the rates are included at right in each chart. Note that growth scores cannot be calculated for some proportion of students due to missing prior year scores, and as such the data presented here do not include all fourth through eighth grade students who took the grade-level MAP in 2017. The growth score can be interpreted as follows. A score of 50 equates to a student whose normative score gain from 2016 to 2017 was exactly as predicted. Students whose growth score falls above 50 made gains (in relation to all students at their grade level across the state) that were greater than predicted based on past performance. Students with a growth score under 50 increased their performance less than past performance would predict. The average growth score among students in a grade level, school, or district (and/or the proportion of students with a growth score above 50), provides an indicator of the magnitude of achievement gains students experienced from one school year to the next.

Data Summary:

- For the second consecutive year, SSD students in grades 4-8 who take the grade-level MAP made greater than expected normative gains in math. Average student growth in ELA fell near predicted levels of growth (i.e., the average growth score of 49.4 was very near the median of 50). Overall, average growth scores improved from 2016 to 2017 in both ELA and math.
- Ackerman students have demonstrated strong growth relative to predicted performance in both ELA and math each of the last two school years.
- Students at Litzsinger exhibited normative growth in ELA that was less than predicted each of the last two years. In contrast, Litzsinger students demonstrated improved math growth in 2017.
- Students at Southview demonstrated considerably stronger growth in 2017, in both ELA and math. Southview average growth scores fell well below the median of 50 in 2016 but exceeded 50 in 2017.
- Students attending schools or placements categorized as “External Sites” (these include Bridges, private separate, and homebound placements) demonstrated less than predicted growth in each of the previous two school years.
- JDC students experienced less than predicted growth in ELA, but much greater than predicted growth in math, in 2017. However, these trends are based on the scores of only five students.

Student Growth Scores: English Language Arts


Grade Level MAP (grades 4-8 only)

Label represents average performance against prediction

Scores above 50 exceed predicted performance



Student Counts




Student Growth Scores: Math


Grade Level MAP (grades 4-8 only)

Label represents average performance against prediction

Scores above 50 exceed predicted performance



Student Counts



Strengths and Opportunities for improvement

Strengths:

1. Social studies (i.e., Government EOC) proficiency rates neared 50% each of the last two years.
2. The proportion of Ackerman students performing in the proficient or advanced range was high relative to other SSD separate schools.
3. Proficiency rates among Southview High students increased in 2017.
4. Fewer students taking the grade-level MAP tests performed in the below basic range. The below basic percentage in math for this test type has declined each of the last two years.
5. In many scenarios, African-American students performed equally well as or better than white students on the state assessments (i.e., few racial performance gaps were observed).
6. Students who individually, or whose schools were designated to, receive FRL demonstrated proficiency at higher rates than students not designated to receive FRL (i.e., no socio-economic performance gaps were observed).
7. Among students in grades 4-8 who took the grade-level MAP, average growth rates (relative to predicted growth) increased in 2017. Students demonstrated strong growth in the content area of math relative to predictions based on past performance.

Opportunities for Improvement:

1. Proficiency rates on the science assessments decreased in 2017.
2. Proficiency rates remain low in math (though the District-level MPI in math will improve given a larger percentage of advanced scores and smaller percentage of below basic scores).
3. Proficiency rates among students attending Litzsinger decreased in 2017.
4. Proficiency rates remain low among students at Northview, JDC, and External Sites.
5. A large proportion of students taking the MAP-A format test scored in the below basic range, particularly in math and science.
6. White students performed proficiently at higher rates than did African-American students in ELA and science on the grade-level MAP.

Recommendations For Action

No additional recommendations are offered at this time. Current initiatives related to improving student achievement can be found in the District's Strategic Plan.

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 SSD Life.

Notes

1. SSD requires the DLM (i.e., MAP-A) assessment be completed with students in grades 9 and 10 as well, though their scores are not “accountable” and thus they are omitted from this report.
2. A variety of DESE memos on this topic can be found here: <https://dese.mo.gov/college-career-readiness/assessment>.
3. Per the Missouri DESE website, “The Dynamic Learning Maps™ (DLM) project offers an innovative way for all students with significant cognitive disabilities to demonstrate their learning throughout the school year via the DLM Alternate Assessment System. The traditional multiple choice and status collection of data in a portfolio methods of testing do not always allow students with significant cognitive disabilities to fully demonstrate their knowledge. By integrating assessment with instruction during the year and providing a year-end assessment, the DLM system maps student learning aligned with college and career readiness standards in English language arts and mathematics.” Note that the DLM achievement categories of Emerging, Approaching the Target, At Target, and Advanced differ somewhat from the traditional state assessment achievement categories of Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. Further information about DLM can be found at <http://dynamiclearningmaps.org/missouri> and <http://dese.mo.gov/college-career-readiness/assessment/map-a>.
4. See <https://www.fns.usda.gov/school-meals/community-eligibility-provision>.

Appendix A Reportable Score Counts

State Test Reportable Scores Over 3 Years

Test Type	Year	English			
		Language Arts	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies
EOC	2017		4	104	126
	2016	118	63	129	144
	2015	132	46	153	160
MAP	2017	147	148	68	
	2016	128	129	46	
	2015	119	118	50	
MAPA	2017	227	227	106	
	2016	244	244	127	
	2015	214	212	113	

Reportable Scores by Free and Reduced Lunch Status (2017)

Test Type	FRL Status	English			
		Language Arts	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies
EOC	Is FRL		4	88	110
	Not FRL			16	16
MAP	Is FRL	117	117	55	
	Not FRL	30	31	13	
MAPA	Is FRL	171	171	77	
	Not FRL	56	56	29	

Totals by FRL

FRL Status	English			
	Mathematics	Language Arts	Science	Social Studies
Is FRL	292	288	220	110
Not FRL	87	86	58	16

Reportable Scores by Race (2017)

Test Type	Race	English			
		Language Arts	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies
EOC	Asian				2
	Black		4	79	95
	Multiracial/Other				2
	White			25	27
MAP	Black	79	79	33	
	Hispanic	2	2	2	
	Multiracial/Other	10	10	4	
	White	56	57	29	
MAPA	American Indian	3	3	1	
	Asian	3	3	2	
	Black	104	104	46	
	Hispanic	2	2		
	Multiracial/Other	8	8	6	
	White	107	107	51	

Totals by Race

Race	English			
	Mathematics	Language Arts	Science	Social Studies
American Indian	3	3	1	
Asian	3	3	2	2
Black	187	183	158	95
Hispanic	4	4	2	
Multiracial/Other	18	18	10	2
White	164	163	105	27