**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>Measureable Objective 1:</th>
<th>80% positive placement for graduates, defined as related employment, continuation of a related Program of Study through continued education, or Military Service.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Results:                | Positive DESE Placement = 93% (Full day Students)  
North Technical all Students (½ and full day) who attended at least one semester = 87%  
South Technical all Students (½ day only) who attended at least one semester = 80% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measureable Objective 2:</th>
<th>Student Mastery of Program specific essential workplace competencies as tracked in the Instructional System Manager(ISM's). First year will master 40 percent or more of essential task list by end of year and second year students will master 80 percent or more of the essential task list by end of year two.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results:</td>
<td>Percent of Essential Tasks Mastered at end of Quarter Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measureable Objective 3:</th>
<th>Increase from previous year in the number of programs scoring above 70 percent Program Performance as measured with Program Status Indicator (PSI) Scorecard.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results:</td>
<td>The 2010 school year PSI scorecard data reflects 41 of 54 program sections scored above 70 percent Program Performance as measured by established criteria, and that in the 2011 school year 46 of 55 program sections scored above 70 percent Program Performance. Number of Programs with PSI at or above 70% by Results by Campus are as follows:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Programs</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td># Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Tech</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tech</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measureable Objective 4: Percent of seniors taking the Technical Skills Assessments (TSA) exam will meet or exceed minimum level determined by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

Results: 97.1% of eligible students took approved TSA for their Program; DESE requirement 75%.

Measureable Objective 5: Percent of seniors passing the Technical Skills Assessments (TSA) exam will meet or exceed minimum level determined by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

Results: 71.7% of students who took an approved TSA met the cut score for the TSA; DESE requirement 62%.

Goal 2: Prepare students to continue their education and become lifelong learners.

Measureable Objective 1: 80 percent positive placement for graduates.

Results: Positive DESE Placement = 93%
North Technical all Students (½ and full day) who attended at least one semester = 87%
South Technical all Students (½ day only) who attended at least one semester = 80%

Measureable Objective 2: Technical School programs will meet Adequate Yearly Progress measures as applicable.

Results: North Technical
Communication Arts = Met (CI/71.2%)
Mathematics = Met (CI/62.1%)
Additional Indicators - Graduation = Met 99.50%

Measureable Objective 3: Annual Review of twenty (20) percent of Program Curriculum for five (5) year review cycle.

Results: Met – 30.2% of total curriculum was reviewed in 2010-2011; 100% of scheduled curricula were reviewed by staff and approved by the Board of Education for the 2010-2011 Academic Year.

What do key staff and stakeholders consider to be the strengths and opportunities for improvement/weaknesses of the program? Stakeholder input was gathered through Focus Groups, Program Review and Questionnaires, Advisory Committee meetings, Student Follow-up Results, State of Missouri Data and School Climate Survey.
Strengths

- **Strength 1**
  Fully developed and well organized curriculum for a wide variety of Career and Technical Education Programs with opportunities for active and hands on learning, along with facilities and equipment, were frequently cited as strengths by Faculty in Program Review Questionnaires. Program offerings exceed Perkins requirements for Scope of Programs offered.
- **Strength 2**
  Student achievement; students perform well as measured by mastery of Program specific ISM’s (essential competencies), TSA Scores, End of Course Exams, and participation in Career Technical Student Organizations, including State and National competitions.
- **Strength 3**
  Positive Program Outcomes; a high percentage of student concentrators and completers find employment or matriculate to postsecondary institutions.

Opportunities/Weaknesses

- **Opportunity 1**
  Align curriculum and essential competencies to TSA’s in program areas where student performance data is available.
- **Opportunity 2**
  Program Advisory Committee members suggested Chairs meet by Cluster to share best practices.
- **Opportunity 3**
  Update instructional laboratory and shop equipment and provide instructional staff professional development on use of updated equipment and new technologies.
- **Opportunity 4**
  Increase the ratio of computers to students.

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

PSI Scorecard and on the StAR Scorecard data suggest that priorities, instructional strategies and activities implemented are in overall alignment with program goals. Continuous improvement practices should be applied to assure program offerings are also in alignment with the State economic development goals, student needs and that processes increase efficiency in operations.
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 X No
If Yes describe change in priorities.

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

Evaluation Implications
Data reported on the PSI Score Card suggests an improvement in student performance on TSA tests across a majority of program areas would likely yield the most positive immediate results and should receive priority as an area of focus.

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.
X ☐ Other;

Continue Technical Education Program offerings implementing the following action plan to address identified opportunities for improvement.

Action Plan

1) Evaluate both the appropriateness of selected TSA’s and the timing of the administration of TSA’s for Technical Programs not meeting State cut scores.
2) TSA’s should lead to a student certification where possible.
3) Provide Program Advisory Committee Chairs opportunity to meet by Cluster.
4) Streamline Enhancement Grant Equipment (and computer) Acquisition Process for increased efficiency.
5) Identify specific staff professional development activities associated with newly employed equipment and technologies.
Cost and Funding Source
Enhancement Grant funds can be maximized at the current 75% reimbursement rate for qualifying purchases.

Staff professional development and curriculum development activities will continue to be funded through appropriate building and Perkins budgets.

Review of 2010-2011 Recommendations

Program retention is critical to maintaining operating programs at capacity; there are limited opportunities for students to enroll in slots that have opened due to students who were not retained. Pilot a Student Retention project in select Programs (i.e. Noel Levitz Student Retention Survey or similar tool) to identify student needs and to enable the Schools to provide proper support services at the proper time.

Noel Levitz Student Retention Survey was piloted in the LPN Program with a corresponding increase in retention in most cohort groups, however the instrument is expensive and not readily adaptable to secondary students. Staff will continue to search for or develop a cost effective alternative for the secondary age group.

Collect data through follow up causes/reasons why students return to sending schools without completing Programs.

Some preliminary data has been collected as for most common reasons as given by students for not returning. As many students who do not return simply stop attending without notice, continued contact with this group is difficult and inconsistent. Collection of data directly from former students' counselors through survey and/or focus group is being pursued as an alternative.

Evaluate viability of low enrollment Programs; Program planning based on assessment and review will give direction towards a balance of student interest, students able to enroll in first choice programs and opportunities existing in the marketplace for program completers. The inclusion of a cost analyses at the Program level may provide determining Program viability.

Two sections of low enrollment programs offering have been deemed not cost effective and are being suspended; one program section is being reduced for the same reason. One section of a high demand program was expanded to increase first choice offerings.

Compare student satisfaction with peer institutions; by identifying and using a common survey instrument used by similar technical institutions in Missouri and surrounding states, it would be possible to make decisions based on comparative data from peer institutions. Implementation of this recommendation would be dependent on participation of peer institutions.

The Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey was administered and baseline data was collected at the end of academic year 2010-2011 and is being analyzed; data collection is being continued this year.

Investigate and review academic assessments to assure the assessment process prepares students for matriculation to post secondary institutions or the World of Work as appropriate by Program area.

Staff has identified the early administration of the ACT COMPASS assessment as an opportunity to improve student matriculation into postsecondary institutions. Staff will be able to coordinate testing with post-secondary institutions, remediate students, and assure student applications to those institutions are timely and complete.