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Description of the Program (2010-2012)
SSD's Career and Technical Education Division operates two technical high schools with more than 30 programs in a wide range of technical areas. Technical course offerings range from traditional technical fields, such as precision machining and construction, to such burgeoning fields as network administration and health sciences. Programs at the two schools accept applications from all 10th- through 12th-grade students from St. Louis County.

Description of How the Program's Services are Developed and Delivered
SSD has offered technical education since the opening of South Technical High School in 1967. Instructors work in collaboration with industry advisory groups to identify the skills needed to succeed in each technical area. Staff review curricula on a five year cycle to ensure that the program offerings are relevant to the workplace. The program purchases equipment necessary to provide authentic learning experiences aligned to post-secondary education and to the workplace. Staff identify essential skills for each program and track student progress throughout the program, and students complete Technical Skill Assessments (TSAs) upon completion of each program to assess student learning.

Career and Technical Education Program offerings are approved and operated in compliance with DESE Rules and Regulations, including the authorization of the local Carl D. Perkins Plan (Perkins).

Key Program Stakeholder Groups
- Students
- Parents
- Staff
- Administrators
- Board of Education
- Taxpayers
- Other (CTE Board Member, Employers, Post Secondary Educational Institutions)

Student and/ or Stakeholder Needs Addressed by the Program
Career and Technical Education meets the needs of individuals and the community by preparing individuals to apply business practices, services and the industrial arts to improve the economic well-being of individuals, the region and the State;

1) Graduates learn workplace skills and economic concepts through application.
2) A competitive workforce is developed through improved technical and workplace skills of graduates.
3) The standard of living for the region and state is improved by improved services and efficient application of technologies.
4) Special School District Career Technical Education Programs serve as the entry point to numerous Career Pathways that matriculate to post-secondary educational institutions and culminate in employment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Goals of the Program</th>
<th>Expected Measurable Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Goal 1:** Prepare students for successful careers and gainful employment through their mastery of program specific and general workplace skills. | 1.1 Meet Positive Student Placement rates for Perkins Standards.  
1.2 95% of seniors will demonstrate mastery of essential program specific workplace competencies (ISMS). |
| **Goal 2:** Provide equitable access to technical education by attracting a student-body that reflects the demographics of St. Louis County. | 2.1 Percent enrolled by gender and ethnicity will reflect the gender and ethnic makeup of St. Louis County. |
| **Goal 3:** Align Programs with Regional Economic Plans and Needs. | 3.1 Program Performance as measured with Program Status Indicator (PSI) Scorecard will increase overall from previous years. |

**Evaluation Questions**
- What is the status of the program’s progress toward achieving the goals?
- What do students and other stakeholders consider being the strengths and weaknesses of the program?
- What does staff consider to be the strengths and weaknesses of the program?
- How does the program’s actual implementation compare with the program’s design?
- How should priorities be changed to put more focus on achieving the goals?
- How should goals be changed? Any added or removed?

**Data Collection Methods**
- [x] Surveys and questionnaires
- [ ] Interviews
- [x] Document reviews
- [ ] Observations
- [x] Focus groups
- [ ] Case studies
- [x] Assessments
- [ ] Other (Specify)
Evaluation Results

What is the status of the program’s progress toward achieving the goals?

Goal 1: Prepare students for successful careers and gainful employment through their mastery of program specific and general workplace skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurable Objective 1:</th>
<th>1.1 Meet Positive Student Placement rates for Perkins Standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The percent of students at North Tech and South Tech who met the Perkins definition for positive placement was 87% for 2012. The MSIP5 definition of positive placement includes only students who are employed in the field for which they trained. The percent of all tech students meeting the MSIP definition was 75%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSD Positive placement - Perkins and MSIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only SSD CTE students included in DESE counts are those enrolled in SSD, that is, students enrolled full-time at North Tech. Of those students, 98% met the Perkins definition and 89% met the MSIP definition for 2012. The three year status calculation for College and Career Readiness MSIP 5 Standard 3.5-6, derived by averaging the last three years, is 92.4% which is the “Exceeding” maximum rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North Tech Full Day - Perkins and MSIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCT Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSIP 5 College and Career Readiness - Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three year average - NCT Full Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIP 5 Status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board Approved: 5/14/2013, Revised 5/16/2013
Although the MSIP indicator for placement is the maximum rating, the trend for percent of students meeting MSIP definitions of positive placement has declined over the last three years. The data indicate that more students are being hired in areas other than the area that they trained for. There is a misalignment between training and job opportunities.

**Measurable Objective 2:**

1.2 95% of seniors will demonstrate mastery of essential program specific workplace competencies (ISMS).

Results: Not Met. 82.4% of seniors mastered 80% of essential skills identified by program area.

**Goal 2:** Provide equitable access to technical education by attracting a student-body that reflects the demographics of St. Louis County.

**Measurable Objective 1:**

2.1 Percent enrolled by gender and ethnicity will reflect the gender and ethnic makeup of St. Louis County.

**Results:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Tech</th>
<th>St. Louis County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>52.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>47.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>23.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am Indian</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>68.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Measurable Objective 1:**

3.1 Program Performance as measured with Program Status Indicator (PSI) Scorecard will increase overall from previous years.

Results: Met. The rolling average of years 2 and 3 was 76.6% which is higher than the average of years 1 and 2, 75.1%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rolling Average PSI Scorecard</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg. years 1&amp;2</td>
<td>75.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. years 2&amp;3</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data shows a slight decrease in PSI scores from the previous year. The PSI scorecard includes indicators of students placed in the field, and job outlook which may explain the decrease.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean PSI Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Strengths**
- Positive Placement for graduates meets the “Exceeding” standard of MSIP 5.
- The Student Body is diverse, with enrollment by gender close to that of the population.
- Program performance as measured by the PSI scorecard indicates an improvement over the mean of the previous two years.

**Opportunities/Weaknesses**
- The change from a Technical Skill Assessment to an Industry Recognized Credential as a measure of student achievement will require adjustments in assessments, competencies and curriculum.
- Given the change from TSA’s to IRC’s PSI Scorecard needs to be reviewed for appropriate changes.
- IRCs, competencies, and curricula are not aligned.
- There is a misalignment between training programs and job opportunities.

How well aligned are the program’s priorities and processes with the goals of the program?

The program’s priorities and processes are well aligned with the goals of the program.
Deployment Level of Program Services: Services are well deployed, with no significant gaps.

Should priorities be changed to put more focus on achieving the goals? Yes ☐ No
If Yes describe change in priorities.

Citing the Missouri Integrated Workforce Plan and Perkins Guiding Principles; aligning Program Curriculum with the Standards Aligned Career Technical System Education should be the top priority.

Should goals be changed, added or removed? Yes ☒ No
If Yes describe the changes to goals listed.

Evaluation Implications

General Recommendation Resulting from the Evaluation
Select from the following possible recommendations resulting from the evaluation:
☐ Continue the program as is. It is meeting or exceeding all expected outcomes.
☐ 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 (Specify.)

Continue Program with revisions to comply with State and Federal Initiatives outlined in the Missouri Integrated Workforce Plan and the State Education and Training Administration Competency Model.

Action Plans

1) Develop and begin implementation of a plan to expedite the implementation of the Standard Aligned Career Technical Education System;
   a. Review and revise admissions process to be based on appropriate student data.
   b. Investigate developing “Bridge Programs” to prepare student to fully benefit from the CTE Program,
   c. Each CTE Program aligning to high demand Pathways identified at the State and Regional level,
   d. Competency Based Instruction improved by program alignment with ANSI/ISO 9000 recognized standards.
   e. Establishing an operational plan that is based on finding and recommendations of the "Pathways to Prosperity Project and new Perkins Legislation.

2) Revise the PSI Scorecard to include new accountability and increased effectiveness.

3) Continue Professional Development to prepare instructors for implementation of IRC’s into curriculum and competencies.

Review of Action Plans from Previous Report

1) Evaluate both the appropriateness of selected Technical Skill Assessments (TSA) and the timing of the administration of TSA’s for Technical Programs not meeting State cut scores.
TSA assessment was scheduled earlier in the spring semester to allow students the opportunity to retest if necessary.

2) TSA’s should lead to a student certification where possible.

DESE is revising the process of selecting TSA’s to be aligned with Industry Recognized Certifications.

3) Provide Program Advisory Committee Chairs opportunity to meet by Cluster.

Advisory program members elected a chair for each program. A fall and spring meeting was held for the chairs which allowed some portion of the meeting for members to discuss strengths and challenges by cluster.

4) Streamline Enhancement Grant Equipment (and computer) Acquisition Process for increased efficiency.

A Multi-Departmental Project Team charted and reviewed past practice and revised process and implemented revisions. The Revised Process was put in place during the 2011-12 Academic Year.

5) Identify specific staff professional development activities associated with newly employed equipment and technologies.

The Manufacturing Institutes’ Certified Production Technician and Certified Logistics Technician Certifications were identified for implementation. These Certifications align with the St. Louis Community College Workforce Investment Grant Application.

Cost and Funding Source

No additional funding is required.