

# Special School District of St. Louis County Equity Study 2014



*Submitted by* BAFC Consulting  
August 2014



## Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	2
Introduction.....	3
Essential Questions.....	4
Equity Team Members.....	6
SSD Mission, Vision and Values.....	7
Defining Equity.....	8
Section I: Teacher Preparation and Quality.....	9
Section II: Special Education and Related Services.....	27
Special Education/Related Services and Programmatic Offerings.....	28
Special Education Outcomes.....	33
Section III: Career and Technical Education (CTE).....	46
Section IV: Equity in Contracting and Purchasing.....	62
Appendix A: Special Education Profile Report.....	68
Appendix B: Special Education Child Count.....	70
Appendix C: Special Education Child County by Ethnicity.....	71
Appendix D: Special Education Placement Report.....	72
Appendix E: SSD K – 12 Caseload Report.....	74
Appendix F: SSD Area Coordinator Report.....	75
Appendix G: Specialized Programs – Literacy.....	79
Appendix G(2): Specialized Programs – Vocational Skills Program.....	91
Appendix G(3): Specialized Programs – Community-Based Vocational Instruction.....	92
Appendix G(4): Specialized Programs – Applied Behavior Analysis.....	93
Appendix H: MAP Communications Arts.....	94
Appendix H(2): MAP Mathematics.....	102
Appendix I: Post-School Outcomes.....	112
Appendix J: Policy Options and Recommendations (Compiled).....	127

## Executive Summary

**“Let us in education dream of an aristocracy of achievement arising out of a democracy of opportunity.”**

**- Thomas Jefferson**

For more than a half century, Special School District of St. Louis County (SSD) has served the needs of local students. Today the district, in partnership with the 22 other public school districts in St. Louis County, educates more than 21,000 students with disabilities. SSD also offers career and technical education services to nearly 2,000 local teens and young adults.

Simply put, the district’s reach is enormous. In addition to the tens of thousands of students it serves, SSD employs thousands of employees to deliver programs and services to more than 265 schools dispersed throughout an area that encompasses more than 500 square miles.

Because of the complex nature of its offering and the vast area it serves, SSD faces unique challenges in its efforts to provide education services equitably across St. Louis County. In order to ensure that SSD serves its students, schools and communities in the fairest manner possible, the Board of Education for Special School District has commissioned a study to analyze virtually every aspect of its operations including teacher quality, educational programs and services, student achievement, staffing, contracts and purchasing.

In early 2014, St. Louis-based BAFC Consulting was selected to complete the SSD Equity Study. Over the course of many months, the firm’s team of education experts has worked closely with SSD administrators to ensure that the Board of Education has an accurate and comprehensive overview of the district’s operations, viewed through the lens of equity.

For the purposes of this study, BAFC Consulting focused its attention on four broad categories:

- Teacher preparation and quality
- Special Education and related services
- Career and technical education
- Equity on contracting and purchasing

This resulting report offers an in-depth review of Special School District’s operations throughout St. Louis County. The report relies heavily on statistical data, but wherever possible these data are contextualized to offer a better understanding of how the district is serving its community. Additionally, the study’s authors have attempted to offer policy options and recommendations to improve equity wherever applicable.

## Introduction

The Board of Education of Special School District of St. Louis County issued a request for proposals that addressed a need for a study relative to the equity of the programs and services provided by Special School District. The Board requested proposals that would outline a complete and thorough study of operational and educational equity including teacher quality, educational programs and services, student achievement, staffing, contracts and purchasing. BAFC Consulting submitted a response to the RFP and was subsequently issued a contract to conduct the study.

To guide the implementation of the study, BAFC proposed a set of Essential Questions for consideration by the Board. The Essential Questions are designed to assure compliance with the Board's expectations and to provide specific guidance to the study team. The following section outlines the Essential Questions agreed to by the Board and the leadership of BAFC Consulting.

## Essential Questions

**Teacher Preparation and Quality – Does SSD recruit, employ, support and promote a highly qualified professional workforce that is diversified with respect to race, culture and gender?**

1. What is the racial/cultural/gender make-up of the district as a whole and within the assignments to each of the partner districts?
2. Is the district's employee data comparable to the EEOC labor market availability data?
3. What percentage of the faculty and administrative leadership hold bachelor's, master's and doctorate degrees? Are the staffing patterns within the various partner districts comparable with respect to preparation?
4. What is the average tenure (years of experience) of district faculty? Is average tenure comparable between partner districts?
5. What is the profile of the Perceiver Data for individuals employed as teachers in the district? Is the profile data comparable between partner districts?
6. What percentage of faculty request transfers of assignments in a given year? Is the percentage comparable between partner districts?
7. What is the racial and gender breakdown of faculty who have applied for promotions within the district?

**Special Education/Related Services and Programmatic Offerings – Are the identification patterns of students served by SSD comparable to those of the state? Are high-quality programs, special education services and related services equally available to students with disabilities throughout St. Louis County?**

1. What are the special education identification rates (ECSE and School Age) for the district as a whole and for each of the partner districts, disaggregated by disability, race, gender and poverty (free-and-reduced-lunch eligibility)? How do these data compare to statewide averages?
2. What are the staffing patterns, number of students with disabilities, total service minutes, and students-per-teacher at the school buildings? Disaggregate these data for each of the partner districts. What are comparable data for teachers serving students assigned to Separate Day facilities?
3. Are the programs and related services of Special School District comparably provided to students in the various partner districts?

**Special Education Outcomes – Do students with disabilities achieve acceptable outcomes with respect to academic achievement and other measures associated with the Performance Categories associated with the IDEA? What factors lead to the higher achievement and better outcomes for students served by SSD?**

1. What are the MAP and EOC data for students served by SSD as a whole and separated by district and school building? Are there differences within this data associated with race, gender, disability and poverty?
2. What are the attendance rates for students with disabilities served by SSD as a whole and disaggregated by district and school building? Are there differences within this data associated with race, gender, disability and poverty?

3. What are the discipline, graduation and dropout rates for students with disabilities served by SSD as a whole and disaggregated by district? Are there differences within this data associated with race, gender, disability and poverty?
4. What are the SAT, ACT, COMPASS and ASVAB data for students served by SSD as a whole and separated by district? Are there differences within this data associated with race, gender, disability and poverty?
5. What are the post-secondary follow-up data for students with disabilities served by SSD as a whole and disaggregated by district? Are there differences within this data for race, gender, disability and poverty?
6. What are the administrative structures, programs or services that contribute to higher performance in identified partner districts?

**Career and Technical Education – Do students served by the CTE programs of Special School District receive industry-accredited services and achieve outcomes that support further career education or job placement? Are programs and services provided by the SSD comparable to those of other suburban areas in the state?**

1. How do North and South Technical High Schools compare with respect to program offerings, enrollment requirements and enrollment? This data should be disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender and disability.
2. How do students enrolled in the technical high schools perform with respect to EOC data, dropout and graduation data, program completion data, measures of industry standards, and placement/continuing education data? These data should be disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender and disability.
3. What CTE programs are partner districts providing? What planning processes and supports from Special District are in place to assess and support the development of CTE programs in Partner Districts? What are the student outcomes (as identified in #2 above)?
4. How do SSD programs and outcome data, as identified in #1 and #2 above, compare to CTE programs in other suburban areas of the state?

**Contracting and Purchasing – Are Special School District procedures sufficiently open and transparent to encourage participation by minority and women contractors across the various business functions of the district?**

1. Do the business policies and procedures of the district address/encourage minority and women participation?
2. What have other suburban and urban school districts done to encourage minority and female businesses to contract with them?
3. What impact does in-state versus out-of-state contracting have on minority and female participation?
4. What impact does union versus non-union contracts have on minority and female participation?
5. How are minority and female contractors currently reflected in the contracts and services provided to the district?

## **Equity Team Members**

The Equity Study was conducted by a team of experienced professional educators. A specific team was assigned to address each of the Essential Questions. Team members were selected based on their professional background and expertise related to the topic of the study. The overall study was organized and facilitated by Dr. Paul Doerrler and Dr. John Heskett. Team members were as follows:

### **Teacher Preparation and Quality**

Dr. Jack Williams, Chair

Dr. Linda Holliday

Mr. Bill Korte

### **Special Education, Related Services and Programmatic Offerings/Special Education Outcomes**

Dr. Patricia Kopetz, Co-Chair

Mr. Marc Montgomery, Co-Chair

Ms. Mary Dell Black

Mr. Roosevelt Ferguson

Ms. Jan Keenoy

Mr. Kent Robison

Ms. Linda Washburn

### **Career and Technical Education**

Ms. Denise Driscoll, Chair

Mr. Randy Charles

Mr. Dan Ehlenbeck

Dr. Terry Heiman

### **Contracting and Purchasing**

Mr. Randy Charles, Chair

Mr. Tom Quinn

## SSD Mission, Vision and Values

Special School of Saint Louis County (SSD) has crafted a defined mission statement, vision statement and a statement of core values. They follow:

### **Mission:**

In collaboration with partner districts, we provide technical education and a wide variety of individualized educational and support services designed for each student's successful contribution to our community.

### **Vision:**

Partners for every student's success.

### **Core Values:**

- **Student Success** – We strive to actualize student potential and facilitate student success.
- **Collaboration** – We work collaboratively with parents, students, partner districts and community resources to benefit students.
- **Integrity** – We seek to create a fiscally responsible, honest, responsive and compassionate environment valuing and appreciating all people.
- **Stewardship** – We are good stewards of the students, the resources and the educational initiatives entrusted to us.
- **Continuous Improvement** – We use a systematic approach to continuously improve performance at all levels of the organization.
- **Equity** – We use a systematic approach to ensure equal access at all levels of the organization.



## Defining Equity

*The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* (Third Edition) defines “equity” as: a) The state, quality or ideal of being just, impartial and fair; b) something that is just, impartial and fair; and, c) in law – justice applied in circumstances covered by law yet influenced by principles of ethics and fairness. The same dictionary defines “just” as: a) Honorable and fair in one’s dealings and actions; b) consistent with what is morally right, righteous, a just cause; and c) properly due or merited. Its definition for “impartial” is not partial or biased, unprejudiced. It also defines “fair” in this context as: a) Having or exhibiting a disposition that is free of favoritism or bias, impartial; b) just to all parties, equitable; c) being in accordance with relative merit or significance (fair share); and d) consistent with rules, logic or ethics. Synonyms listed for “fair” include: just, equitable, impartial, unprejudiced, unbiased, objective and dispassionate. Others include: reasonable, objective, honest, evenhanded, open-minded and rational.

The continuous improvement model that SSD uses does not define “equity”; however, it does provide guidance regarding “Ethical Behavior.” It uses the term “ethical behavior” to refer to how the organization ensures that all its decisions, actions and stakeholder interactions conform to the district’s moral and professional principles of conduct. These principles should support all applicable laws and regulations and are the foundation for the district’s culture and values. They distinguish “right” from “wrong.” Well-designed and clearly articulated ethical principles empower people to make effective decisions with confidence. SSD uses “equity” as an ethical principle that is both a desired condition and a restricting boundary that prevents adverse impacts on students, parents, staff and partner districts.

SSD provides services to students in and from 22 school districts. Those districts vary in many ways including size, resources, personnel, physical facilities, academic and social experiences of students, instructional approaches, curricula and academic performance results. No one assumes the poorest districts in St. Louis County are able to offer the same quality and level of educational opportunities as the wealthiest. Since 1975 the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) has guided the development of special education services for children and youth with disabilities throughout this country resulting in a common understanding of what constitutes a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE). Today these requirements are the standards. Equity does not infer the same for everyone.

While SSD uses the term “equity” in a number of its statements and documents, equity is not officially defined nor are measures or indicators in place. This report uses “fairness” as a definition for “equity.” As policies, processes and practices were examined the team used concepts such as fair, just and impartial when preparing findings and recommendations.

## Section I: Teacher Preparation and Quality

The foundation of excellent teaching and educational services lies in the preparation and quality of teachers and leaders. The data received and analyzed by the study team support the observation that Special School District has a diverse educational staff and compares well to national teacher preparation data and state data relative to the available labor market resources in Missouri; the staff is well prepared with the vast majority of the instructional staff holding master's, specialist or doctoral degrees; and the staff has broad experience working in special education.

The study team would like to recognize Dr. Bohannon and his staff for the professional and collaborative efforts they demonstrated in gathering the extensive data represented in this report. This report would not have been possible without their assistance.

### Ethnicity

Research recognizes a diverse educational staff as an asset in any educational institution. A diverse staff educating students at the elementary and secondary levels supports educational achievement, social acceptance, equity of expectations and the self-image of the students. Diversity is highly valued. For Special School District, the employment of a diverse staff continues to be both highly valued and a goal of the Board.

The data demonstrate that the district has achieved a diverse staff with respect to race/culture/ethnicity. However, the data also suggests that SSD employees of color – defined as all non-white staff – are represented at higher levels in certain partner districts and SSD buildings. Overall, employees of color represent 17% of the instructional staff and 12% of administrators in the district. A further analysis of the data reveals the district has assigned 2% or fewer teachers of color in eight partner districts; and has assigned 20% or more teachers of color in five partner districts. The ethnicity of Area Directors and Area Coordinators are represented in the overall administrator category of 12% persons of color. It was not possible to break out the assignment of these administrators by ethnicity and by partner district.

The assignment of administrators in SSD facilities is similarly variable. Persons of color represent 15% of administrators at the Central Garage, 17% at Central Administration and 25% at North Technical High School. There are no persons of color at any of the remaining district facilities.

The following charts and tables provide specific data to support the observations noted above.

**Table 1: SSD Instructional Staff**

School Year	Total Employee Count
2011 – 2012	4,357
2012 – 2013	4333
2013 – 2014	4368

**Table 2: Instructional Staff of Color (Non-white)**

School Year	% Employees of Color
2011 – 2012	17%
2012 – 2013	16%
2013 – 2014	17%

**Table 3: Instructional Staff Ethnicity**

	2011 – 2012		2012 – 2013		2013 – 2014	
Ethnicity	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
American Indian/Alaskan	2	0.05%	3	0.07%	3	0.07%
Asian - Pacific Islander	27	0.62%	26	0.60%	27	0.62%
Black (non-Hispanic)	657	15.08%	623	14.38%	657	15.04%
Hispanic	19	0.44%	18	0.42%	19	0.43%
Multi-Racial	44	1.01%	41	0.95%	39	0.89%
White (non-Hispanic)	3,608	82.81%	3,622	83.59%	3,623	82.94%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,357</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>4,333</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>4,368</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Table 4: Teachers Only Ethnicity**

	2011 – 2012		2012 – 2013		2013 – 2014	
Ethnicity	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
American Indian/Alaskan	1	0.04%	1	0.04%		
Asian - Pacific Islander	11	0.42%	10	0.39%	11	0.43%
Black (non-Hispanic)	203	7.75%	193	7.49%	200	7.81%
Hispanic	14	0.53%	13	0.50%	13	0.51%
Multi-Racial	21	0.80%	20	0.78%	20	0.78%
White (non-Hispanic)	2,368	90.45%	2,339	90.80%	2,317	90.47%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,618</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,576</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,561</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Table 5: SSD Teacher Ethnicity by District Assignment**

	2011 – 2012			2012 – 2013			2013 – 2014		
District	Total Teachers	Number Teachers of Color	Percent Teachers of Color	Total Teachers	Number Teachers of Color	Percent Teachers of Color	Total Teachers	Number Teachers of Color	Percent Teachers of Color
Affton	46	3	7%	45	1	2%	44	1	2%
Bayless	24	1	4%	25	1	4%	24	1	4%
Brentwood	16	1	6%	16	0	0%	15	0	0%
Central Admin	455	23	5%	534	42	8%	538	46	9%
Clayton	28	0	0%	27	0	0%	26	0	0%
Ferg-Flor	166	31	19%	153	26	17%	156	29	19%
Hancock	25	1	4%	25	1	4%	24	1	4%
Hazelwood	236	46	19%	233	45	19%	242	46	19%
Jennings	55	19	35%	51	19	37%	51	24	47%
Kirkwood	72	2	3%	72	1	1%	70	2	3%
Ladue	66	0	0%	70	0	0%	70	0	0%
Lindbergh	77	2	3%	81	3	4%	80	2	3%
Maplewood	19	2	11%	18	3	17%	18	3	17%
Mehlville	159	2	1%	157	1	1%	158	1	1%
Normandy	159	45	28%	70	23	33%	62	19	31%
Parkway	323	7	2%	320	11	3%	316	10	3%
Pattonville	86	2	2%	85	2	2%	85	2	2%
Ritenour	103	10	10%	102	10	10%	98	11	11%
Riverview	105	31	30%	103	29	28%	100	29	29%
Rockwood	260	7	3%	256	7	3%	257	5	2%
U City	49	12	24%	48	10	21%	44	10	23%
Valley Park	20	0	0%	20	0	0%	19	0	0%
Webster	69	3	4%	65	2	3%	64	2	3%
<b>Total Teachers</b>	<b>2,618</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>2,576</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>2,561</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>10%</b>

**Table 6: SSD Administrators**

School Year	Employee Count
2011 – 2012	203
2012 – 2013	199
2013 – 2014	201

**Table 7: Administrators of Color (Non-white)**

School Year	% Administrators of Color
2011 – 2012	12%
2012 – 2013	14%
2013 – 2014	12%

**Table 8: Administrator Ethnicity**

	<b>2011 – 2012</b>		<b>2012 – 2013</b>		<b>2013 – 2014</b>	
<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Black (non-Hispanic)	22	10.84%	27	13.57%	24	11.94%
Hispanic	2	0.99%	1	0.50%	1	0.50%
White (non-Hispanic)	179	88.18%	171	85.93%	176	87.56%
<b>Total</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Table 9: SSD Administrators of Color (Non-white)**

<b>Location</b>	<b>2011 – 2012</b>	<b>2012 – 2013</b>	<b>2013 – 2014</b>
Ackerman	0%	0%	0%
Bridges/Page/Wirtz	0%	0%	0%
Central Administration	13%	16%	15%
Central Garage	17%	17%	17%
Central Maintenance	25%	25%	0%
District-Wide Instruction	0%	0%	0%
Juvenile Detention Center	0%	0%	0%
Learning Center	0%	0%	0%
Litzsinger	0%	0%	0%
Neuwoehner	0%	0%	0%
North Technical High School	50%	50%	25%
Northview	0%	0%	0%
South Technical High School	0%	0%	0%
South Garage	0%	0%	0%
Southview	0%	0%	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>12%</b>

## Gender

Equity with respect to gender has proven to be a particularly difficult achievement in all of education. Such is also the case in Special School District. More than 85% of the instructional staff is female and the data are relatively consistent throughout the instructional staff assignments in both SSD facilities and partner district programs. Only one partner district exceeds 15% males in the instructional staff. And similar to the data in education throughout the country, administrators are generally male in most of the district facilities. Of particular note though is the category of Central Administration – the category of both central office administrators and instructional leaders assigned to the partner districts – where males represent 16% of the group. The following charts and tables provide specific data to support the observations offered above.

**Table 10: Instructional Staff Gender**

	2011 – 2012		2012 – 2013		2013 – 2014	
<b>Gender</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Female	3,862	88.64%	3,843	88.69%	3,846	88.05%
Male	495	11.36%	490	11.31%	522	11.95%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,357</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>4,333</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>4,368</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Table 11: Teacher Only Gender**

	2011 – 2012		2012 – 2013		2013 – 2014	
<b>Gender</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Female	2,355	89.95%	2,318	89.98%	2,296	89.65%
Male	263	10.05%	258	10.02%	265	10.35%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,618</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,576</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,561</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Table 12: SSD Instructional Staff Gender by District Assignment**

<b>District</b>	<b>2011 – 2012 Percent of Males</b>	<b>2012 – 2013 Percent of Males</b>	<b>2013 – 2014 Percent of Males</b>
Affton	6%	7%	7%
Bayless	10%	9%	10%
Brentwood	11%	12%	4%
Central Administration	18%	20%	20%
Clayton	6%	8%	10%
Ferguson-Florissant	11%	10%	12%
Hancock Place	7%	6%	4%
Hazelwood	13%	11%	11%
Jennings	7%	5%	6%
Kirkwood	12%	10%	12%
Ladue	7%	4%	6%
Lindbergh	11%	10%	12%
Maplewood Richmond Heights	17%	14%	17%
Mehlville	7%	10%	10%
Normandy	25%	12%	11%
Parkway	8%	9%	10%
Pattonville	10%	11%	12%
Ritenour	12%	10%	11%
Riverview Gardens	7%	10%	10%
Rockwood	7%	8%	9%
University City	10%	9%	5%
Valley Park	6%	6%	3%
Webster Groves	4%	5%	6%
<b>Overall Percent of Males</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>12%</b>

**Table 13: SSD Teacher Gender by District Assignment**

<b>District</b>	<b>2011 – 2012 Percent of Males</b>	<b>2012 – 2013 Percent of Males</b>	<b>2013 – 2014 Percent of Males</b>
Affton	2%	2%	2%
Bayless	8%	12%	13%
Brentwood	6%	6%	0%
Central Administration	16%	21%	21%
Clayton	4%	4%	0%
Ferguson-Florissant	9%	9%	10%
Hancock Place	8%	8%	4%
Hazelwood	11%	9%	8%
Jennings	5%	2%	2%
Kirkwood	8%	8%	10%
Ladue	3%	3%	4%
Lindbergh	9%	9%	10%
Maplewood Richmond Heights	11%	6%	11%
Mehlville	5%	7%	7%
Normandy	29%	9%	6%
Parkway	6%	6%	7%
Pattonville	10%	11%	11%
Ritenour	7%	6%	8%
Riverview Gardens	10%	12%	12%
Rockwood	6%	5%	7%
University City	6%	4%	2%
Valley Park	10%	10%	5%
Webster Groves	4%	5%	8%
<b>Overall Percent of Male Teachers</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>10%</b>

**Table 14: Male Administrators in SSD Buildings**

<b>Building</b>	<b>2011 - 2012</b>	<b>2012 - 2013</b>	<b>2013 – 2014</b>
Ackerman	50%	50%	50%
Bridges/Page/Wirtz	0%	0%	0%
Central Administration	19%	17%	16%
Central Garage	50%	50%	50%
Central Maintenance	100%	100%	75%
District-Wide Instruction	15%	25%	25%
Juvenile Detention Center	0%	0%	0%
Learning Center	0%	0%	0%
Litzsinger	50%	50%	50%
Neuwoehner	50%	50%	50%
North Technical High School	75%	75%	100%
Northview	50%	50%	50%
South Technical High School	80%	100%	100%
South Garage	0%	0%	0%
Southview	50%	50%	100%
<b>Total Male Administrators</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>24%</b>



### Observations Regarding Ethnicity and Gender

The Teacher Preparation and Quality Team received and analyzed a considerable amount of data provided by the district. As the data were being reviewed it became apparent that while the validity of the data was without question, there was no context for the data to understand its significance. The team sought normative data for comparison purposes and obtained such data from the Missouri Economic Research and Information Center (MERIC) of the Missouri Department of Economic Development. MERIC integrates state administrative data and Census data to provide up-to-date labor market information. The following table provides data regarding the workforce as a whole in St. Louis County. It provides a set of comparative data that allows SSD to determine its relationship with the broader data of the county as a whole with respect to employment data of all employers in the region.

The data suggests that SSD is doing a respectable job of recruiting a diverse workforce with respect to ethnicity and gender. The overall education workforce in St. Louis County is 30% male while SSD's workforce is 24%. Persons of color represent 19% of the workforce in St. Louis County while SSD's workforce is 12%.

**Table 15: Missouri Economic Research and Information Center (MERIC) of the Missouri Department of Economic Development**

<b>Demographic</b>	<b>St. Louis County</b>	<b>% St. Louis County</b>	<b>SSD Instruct. Staff</b>	<b>% SSD Instruct. Staff</b>	<b>SSD Teachers</b>	<b>% SSD Teachers</b>	<b>SSD Admin.</b>	<b>% SSD Admin.</b>
Total Positions	44207		4368		2561		201	
Males	13114	30%	522	12%	265	10%	49	24%
American Indian/Alaskan	95	0%	3	0%				
Asian – Pacific Islander	1091	2%	27	1%	11	0%		
Black	6671	15%	657	15%	200	8%	24	12%
Hispanic*	14070*	32%*	19	0%	13	1%	1	0%
Multi-Racial	363	1%	39	1%	20	1%		
White	35987	81%	3623	83%	2317	90%	176	88%

\* MERIC reports Hispanic data as ethnicity, including all races while SSD data reports on race and ethnicity as discreet groups.

### Preparation and Experience of SSD Staff and Administrators

Special School District employs individuals who have received a high degree of training and preparation. More than 75% of the faculty and more than 83% of administrators hold a master's degree or higher.

The data demonstrated a high degree of similarity between the partner districts with respect to the preparation and experience of instructional staff and teachers employed by SSD and assigned to partner districts. Eighty-one percent of the instructional staff who work in partner districts hold a college degree with only two districts that differ significantly. In those, fewer than 75% held degrees. Similarly, teachers are equally prepared and comparable between partner districts with a district-wide average of 81% holding a Master's Degree or higher. Only three districts differed from this high level averaging 75% or fewer of their teachers holding a master's degree or higher.

Experience was also highly comparable within the partner districts. The average SSD teacher has been employed in the district for 12.7 years. Only two districts has staff assigned with an average of 10 years of experience or less. Another measure of stability in school districts is the range of experience and the percentage of faculty who are on probation. Again, the data demonstrates a high level of comparability within the partner districts. During the 2011-12 school year, SSD averaged 10% of their faculty on probation. Two districts average 15% or more. During the 2012-13 school year, SSD averaged 21% of their faculty on probation. Four districts averaged 25% or more. During the 2013-14 school year, SSD averaged 20% with four districts that averaged 25% or more.

The study team discussed strategies to assess the comparability of teacher quality as measured by SSD's performance evaluation system. However, the Performance Based Teacher Evaluation system is not digitized and securing the data was not practicable.

The following tables provide specific data to support the observations discussed above.

**Table 16: Highest Degree Attained by Instructional Staff**

	2011 – 2012		2012 – 2013		2013 – 2014	
Degree	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
60 Hours	711	16.33%	682	15.78%	674	15.43%
Bachelor	1,296	29.76%	1,333	30.84%	1,418	32.46%
Career Vocational	43	0.99%	44	1.02%	48	1.10%
Doctorate	24	0.55%	26	0.60%	26	0.60%
Master	2,027	46.54%	2,003	46.33%	1,969	45.08%
None	197	4.42%	167	3.86%	159	3.64%
Registered Nurse	7	0.16%	11	0.25%	12	0.27%
Specialist	50	1.15%	57	1.32%	62	1.42%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,355</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>4,323</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>4,368</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Table 17: Highest Degree Attained by SSD Teachers**

<b>Degree</b>	<b>2011 – 2012</b>		<b>2012 – 2013</b>		<b>2013 – 2014</b>	
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Bachelor	482	18.41%	464	18.01%	478	18.66%
Career Vocational	43	1.64%	44	1.71%	48	1.87%
Doctorate	24	0.92%	26	1.01%	26	1.02%
Master	2,019	77.12%	1,985	77.06%	1,947	76.02%
Specialist	50	1.91%	57	2.21%	62	2.42%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,618</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,576</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,561</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Table 18: Highest Degree Attained by SSD Instructional Staff by District Assignment**

<b>District</b>	<b>2011 – 2012</b>		<b>2012 – 2013</b>		<b>2013 – 2014</b>	
	<b>Number w/Degree</b>	<b>Percent w/Degree</b>	<b>Number w/Degree</b>	<b>Percent w/Degree</b>	<b>Number w/Degree</b>	<b>Percent w/Degree</b>
Affton	66	86%	60	90%	60	88%
Bayless	34	81%	37	82%	34	85%
Brentwood	23	82%	22	88%	22	92%
Central Admin	570	73%	684	78%	724	79%
Clayton	31	66%	37	74%	38	76%
Ferguson-Florissant	213	74%	201	73%	204	74%
Hancock Place	33	73%	36	78%	35	76%
Hazelwood	287	80%	286	80%	303	80%
Jennings	72	80%	67	82%	69	81%
Kirkwood	102	88%	104	91%	106	91%
Ladue	90	84%	99	88%	97	89%
Lindbergh	114	86%	123	86%	123	86%
Maplewood RH	25	83%	24	86%	26	87%
Mehlville	207	87%	210	88%	213	89%
Normandy	189	83%	86	71%	79	72%
Parkway	488	80%	493	81%	506	80%
Pattonville	112	85%	109	84%	107	83%
Ritenour	127	76%	129	77%	123	77%
Riverview Gardens	121	79%	122	77%	120	78%
Rockwood	360	81%	363	82%	367	83%
University City	64	71%	64	75%	62	78%
Valley Park	28	85%	29	85%	28	82%
Webster Groves	91	75%	89	77%	89	79%
<b>Overall Degrees</b>	<b>3,443</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>3,474</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>3,535</b>	<b>81%</b>

**Table 19: Highest Degree Attained by SSD Teachers by District Assignment**

District	2011 – 2012		2012 – 2013		2013 – 2014	
	# Master, Doc, Spec Degrees	% Master, Doc, Spec Degrees	# Master, Doc, Spec Degrees	% Master, Doc, Spec Degrees	# Master, Doc, Spec Degrees	% Master, Doc, Spec Degrees
Affton	38	83%	39	87%	36	82%
Bayless	20	83%	20	80%	20	83%
Brentwood	12	75%	14	88%	14	93%
Central Admin	358	79%	400	75%	451	72%
Clayton	24	86%	24	89%	24	92%
Ferguson-Florissant	143	86%	127	83%	123	79%
Hancock Place	21	84%	22	88%	20	83%
Hazelwood	183	78%	187	80%	192	79%
Jennings	44	80%	41	80%	41	80%
Kirkwood	52	72%	55	76%	56	80%
Ladue	56	85%	55	79%	57	81%
Lindbergh	66	86%	64	79%	64	80%
Maplewood RH	17	89%	17	94%	18	100%
Mehlville	137	86%	137	87%	136	86%
Normandy	99	62%	51	73%	46	74%
Parkway	271	84%	264	83%	250	79%
Pattonville	66	77%	65	76%	66	78%
Ritenour	77	75%	75	74%	67	68%
Riverview Gardens	81	77%	79	77%	76	76%
Rockwood	212	82%	220	86%	219	85%
University City	39	80%	38	79%	35	80%
Valley Park	19	95%	19	95%	17	89%
Webster Groves	58	84%	55	85%	55	86%
<b>Overall Master's, Doc &amp; Specialist Degrees</b>	<b>2093</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>2068</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>2035</b>	<b>79%</b>

**Table 20: Highest Degree Attained by SSD Administrators**

Degree	2011 – 2012		2012 - 2013		2013 - 2014	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Associate's	1	0.49%	1	0.50%	1	0.50%
Bachelor's	13	6.40%	15	7.54%	17	8.46%
Doctorate	16	7.88%	17	8.54%	16	7.96%
Jurisprudence	1	0.49%	1	0.50%	1	0.50%
Master's	124	61.08%	121	60.80%	122	60.70%
None	17	8.37%	16	8.04%	15	7.46%
Specialist	31	15.27%	28	14.07%	29	14.43%
<b>Total</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Table 21: Percentage of SSD Administrators with Master's Degrees or Above by Assignment**

<b>Building or Assignment</b>	<b>2011 – 2012</b>	<b>2012 – 2013</b>	<b>2013 – 2014</b>
Ackerman	100%	100%	100%
Bridges/Page/Wirtz	100%	100%	100%
Central Administration	88%	87%	87%
Central Garage	0%	0%	0%
Central Maintenance	25%	25%	25%
District-Wide Instruction	100%	92%	92%
Juvenile Detention Center	100%	100%	100%
Learning Center	100%	100%	100%
Litzsinger	100%	100%	100%
Neuwoehner	100%	100%	100%
North Technical High School	100%	100%	100%
Northview	50%	50%	50%
South Technical High School	80%	80%	80%
South Garage	0%	0%	0%
Southview	100%	100%	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>84%</b>

**Table 22: Teachers Years of Service with SSD by Partner District Assignment**

<b>District</b>	<b>2011 – 2012</b>	<b>2012 – 2013</b>	<b>2013 – 2014</b>
Affton	14.76	16.00	15.11
Bayless	13.17	12.52	13.71
Brentwood	11.93	12.69	14.67
Central Admin	13.68	13.54	13.18
Clayton	15.17	13.26	13.62
Ferguson-Florissant	12.37	12.46	12.18
Hancock Place	13.56	14.12	14.50
Hazelwood	10.64	10.83	10.16
Jennings	12.25	13.86	14.20
Kirkwood	11.70	12.44	12.33
Ladue	14.03	13.96	13.24
Lindbergh	15.25	14.22	14.13
Maplewood Richmond Heights	15.84	15.83	14.61
Mehlville	13.43	13.25	13.40
Normandy	11.42	10.70	11.55
Parkway	13.17	12.79	12.77
Pattonville	15.02	14.61	14.41
Ritenour	11.10	10.57	10.43
Riverview Gardens	11.64	12.27	12.70
Rockwood	13.13	13.34	13.03
University City	14.65	15.27	14.68
Valley Park	15.50	16.50	15.89
Webster Groves	12.52	11.82	11.34
<b>Total</b>	<b>12.92</b>	<b>12.96</b>	<b>12.76</b>

**Table 23: Years of Service by SSD Teachers by Partner District Assignment (2011–12 School Year)**

<b>District</b>	<b>0-2 Years</b>	<b>3-5 Years</b>	<b>6-10 Years</b>	<b>11-20 Years</b>	<b>21-30 Years</b>	<b>31-40 Years</b>	<b>40+ Years</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>#Prob</b>	<b>%Prob</b>
Affton	2	0	11	19	11	3	0	46	2	4%
Bayless	0	3	8	5	7	1	0	24	3	13%
Brentwood	0	1	7	4	3	1	0	16	1	6%
Central Admin	22	22	122	152	101	36	0	455	44	10%
Clayton	3	1	6	10	3	5	0	28	4	14%
Ferguson-Florissant	15	7	47	60	26	11	0	166	22	13%
Hancock Place	0	1	7	9	7	1	0	25	1	4%
Hazelwood	28	9	79	80	29	11	0	236	37	16%
Jennings	1	2	16	23	10	3	0	55	3	5%
Kirkwood	2	3	27	26	11	3	0	72	5	7%
Ladue	1	2	20	26	8	9	0	66	3	5%
Lindbergh	3	2	12	31	20	9	0	77	5	6%
Maplewood RH	0	0	6	7	3	3	0	19	0	0%
Mehlville	8	7	36	62	36	10	0	159	15	9%
Normandy	14	2	53	59	26	5	0	159	16	10%
Parkway	21	12	80	128	59	23	0	323	33	10%
Pattonville	4	4	12	38	19	9	0	86	8	9%
Ritenour	14	6	27	38	11	6	1	103	20	19%
Riverview Gardens	9	3	28	49	11	5	0	105	12	11%
Rockwood	14	10	67	95	60	14	0	260	24	9%
University City	1	1	13	19	9	6	0	49	2	4%
Valley Park	0	0	2	12	5	1	0	20	0	0%
Webster Groves	7	0	17	27	14	4	0	69	7	10%
<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>703</b>	<b>979</b>	<b>489</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2,618</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>10%</b>

**Table 24: Years of Service by SSD Teachers by Partner District Assignment (2012–13 School Year)**

<b>District</b>	<b>0-2 Years</b>	<b>3-5 Years</b>	<b>6-10 Years</b>	<b>11-20 Years</b>	<b>21-30 Years</b>	<b>31-40 Years</b>	<b>Totals</b>	<b>#Prob</b>	<b>%Prob</b>
Affton	0	4	12	15	11	3	45	4	9%
Bayless	1	3	11	4	6	0	25	4	16%
Brentwood	1	3	5	3	3	1	16	4	25%
Central Admin	40	72	127	169	100	26	534	112	21%
Clayton	2	5	6	9	2	3	27	7	26%
Ferguson-Florissant	19	16	38	49	25	6	153	35	23%
Hancock Place	1	0	9	9	5	1	25	1	4%
Hazelwood	29	38	65	69	26	6	233	67	29%
Jennings	0	8	13	18	9	3	51	8	16%
Kirkwood	2	7	26	25	9	3	72	9	13%
Ladue	4	4	22	26	8	6	70	8	11%
Lindbergh	7	9	14	27	21	3	81	16	20%
Maplewood RH	1	0	6	6	4	1	18	1	6%
Mehlville	7	19	43	50	33	5	157	26	17%
Normandy	8	9	19	27	7	0	70	17	24%
Parkway	21	55	65	119	48	12	320	76	24%
Pattonville	8	10	8	36	16	7	85	18	21%
Ritenour	16	22	21	29	11	3	102	38	37%
Riverview Gardens	10	9	29	41	8	6	103	19	18%
Rockwood	20	26	61	88	53	8	256	46	18%
University City	1	4	13	16	8	6	48	5	10%
Valley Park	0	0	2	13	5	0	20	0	0%
Webster Groves	8	7	18	22	8	2	65	15	23%
<b>Total</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>633</b>	<b>870</b>	<b>426</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>2,576</b>	<b>536</b>	<b>21%</b>



**Table 25: Years of Service by SSD Teachers by Partner District Assignment (2013–14 School Year)**

<b>District</b>	<b>0-2 Years</b>	<b>3-5 Years</b>	<b>6-10 Years</b>	<b>11-20 Years</b>	<b>21-30 Years</b>	<b>31-40 Years</b>	<b>Totals</b>	<b>#Prob</b>	<b>%Prob</b>
Affton	2	1	12	18	9	2	44	3	7%
Bayless	0	4	9	4	7	0	24	4	17%
Brentwood	1	1	4	5	3	1	15	2	13%
Central Admin	39	57	154	169	101	18	538	96	18%
Clayton	2	3	7	10	2	2	26	5	19%
Ferguson-Florissant	22	17	40	50	20	7	156	39	25%
Hancock Place	1	0	6	11	6	0	24	1	4%
Hazelwood	33	41	72	69	23	4	242	74	31%
Jennings	1	1	16	21	10	2	51	2	4%
Kirkwood	2	7	23	29	8	1	70	9	13%
Ladue	5	3	24	27	5	6	70	8	11%
Lindbergh	4	13	11	30	20	2	80	17	21%
Maplewood RH	0	0	7	8	3	0	18	0	0%
Mehlville	10	15	39	60	28	6	158	25	16%
Normandy	7	6	16	25	7	1	62	13	21%
Parkway	33	39	69	116	48	11	316	72	23%
Pattonville	6	10	15	35	12	7	85	16	19%
Ritenour	20	16	21	28	10	3	98	36	37%
Riverview Gardens	9	6	25	48	7	5	100	15	15%
Rockwood	21	28	64	86	50	8	257	49	19%
University City	1	2	15	15	8	3	44	3	7%
Valley Park	1	0	2	11	5	0	19	1	5%
Webster Groves	7	8	20	17	9	3	64	15	23%
<b>Total</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>671</b>	<b>892</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>2,561</b>	<b>505</b>	<b>20%</b>

### Perceiver Data

SSD utilizes two instruments to aid in the selection of applicants to be interviewed for vacant positions. The instruments are designed as measures to predict the likelihood of success in education and as a measure of racial/cultural sensitivity. All applicants who are selected from the initial screening of application materials participate in these two processes. Those who achieve an acceptable score are then referred to supervisors/principals who hold vacancies for which the individual is qualified. A final decision regarding employment is made based on the individual's qualifications in the pre-selection/screening process and the interview/reference process offered by supervisory personnel.

There is a basal score on the Perceiver Assessment that is expected of all individuals employed in the district, depending on the category of the position. The data shared with the team suggested there is a considerable range of scores for individuals who have been employed for comparable positions. The Directors and Area Coordinators have considerable latitude in selecting individuals for their vacant positions and use the Perceiver Data as one factor in the selection. The data that is stored for the Perceiver process is essentially in raw data format. The team found the data extensive but not in a format that would allow comparisons or analyses that were anticipated by the Board.

### Transfer Data

The Equity Study anticipated an opportunity to compile and analyze data regarding the number of transfer requests made yearly. Specifically, the inquiries were to provide data to assess the relative number of such transfer requests in the aggregate and to determine if there were certain partner districts in which there was an under- or over-representation of requests. Interviews with the administrative leadership revealed the transfer data to be duplicated data. That is, one teacher may request a transfer at the beginning of the year upon awareness of a vacancy in another district, and then request two or three additional transfers later in the school year when other vacancies became available. Additionally, the requests were not maintained in a digital format. Therefore the study team and district administrators were unable to organize, group and re-group the data to provide answers to questions related to the actual number of teachers making the requests and the number granted.

### Applications for Promotions

The Equity Study Team was prepared to provide an analysis of SSD personnel who applied for promotions within the district. The queries were to be designed to provide the Board with information related to the racial and gender distributions of those applying and receiving promotions. However, data was not available to the team to conduct the analysis. Regulations and guidelines from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) prohibit employers from discrimination in employment and advancement decisions. The process anticipated by the EEOC is a racial/gender-free process that ensures that neither factor is a determining factor in the selection process. Employers are therefore prohibited from collecting such data from applicants, except that applicants may voluntarily provide such information about themselves.

The data that is maintained by the district contains significant lapses of such data, such that appropriate analysis is not feasible.

**Table 26: Race/Ethnicity Promotion Data for 2011-12 and 2012-13 School Years**

Race/Ethnicity	July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012		July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
No Response	73	33.1%	107	33%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	0.5%	2	0.6%
Hispanic	1	0.5%	5	1.5%
Black	43	19.5%	72	22.2%
Multi-Racial	7	3.2%	11	3.4%
White	95	43.2%	128	39.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>220</b>		<b>325</b>	

**Table 27: Gender Promotion Data for 2011-12 and 2012-23 School Years**

Gender	July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012		July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
No Response	72	32.7%	105	32.3%
Female	112	50.9%	153	47.1%
Male	36	16.4%	67	20.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>220</b>		<b>325</b>	

## Policy Options and Recommendations

The following policy options or recommendations are offered for consideration by the Board and Superintendent:

1. Essential questions relating to the use of the Perceiver System, Promotions and Transfers were not able to be addressed because of issues of data availability. If the Board desires further investigation relative to these areas, district staff must devise a data storage and analysis protocol that will support such an inquiry.
2. There has been a perception by some in St. Louis County that Special School District employees in North County districts are less qualified than in school districts in other parts of the county, and that teachers tend to transfer out of North County districts when other opportunities arise. The data suggests otherwise. The tables presented in this report demonstrate that 79% of all teachers hold at least a master's degree. When viewed at individual districts there is some variation, but the measure of central tendency is relatively stable from district to district. Ritenour is the district with the lowest percentage at 68%, followed by Central Administration at 72% and Normandy at 74%. Similarly the data on teacher longevity demonstrated that 54% of teachers in the district have been employed in the district for 10 years or more. Again the measure of central tendency was relatively stable with the Ritenour and Webster Groves School Districts at the lowest levels with 42% and 45% respectively. Data regarding transfer requests were not available for compilation and analysis. Neither were aggregate/non-identifiable data on teacher evaluations. The district can consider the relative value of collecting and analyzing such data to provide a more definitive response to the questions of staff competence across the district.
3. Overall the district has recruited and employed a diverse workforce. The data demonstrate the level of diversity to be comparable to employment data for St. Louis County. The assignments of staff have produced higher representation of minority staff in the North County area. Generally, the higher representation of minority staff aligns with school districts in which students of color are higher percentages of the student population.

The district has a policy option relative to the current pattern. The higher representation of minority staff in school districts in which students of color are the majority – or at least a higher percentage of the student population compared to other school districts – allows students of color to see their adult role models in positions of authority and professionalism. Some school districts find such a staffing pattern to be effective as the staff and administration relate to the cultural, behavioral and academic needs of their students of color.

However, such a pattern of staff assignment by SSD has resulted in a much lower representation of professionals of color in majority white school districts. Some school districts have found it beneficial for staff of color to be represented in schools where students of color are in the minority. Anecdotal evidence suggests significant role models of color provide unique support for students of color and may have positive impacts on both academic and non-academic aspects of the school experience.

There is no evidence that the staffing patterns observed by this team were the result of policy directives from the Board or district administration. However, they do exist. The district may wish to determine if the current pattern meets the needs of the students and district, or if a change in the pattern would be desirable.

## Section II: Special Education and Related Services

Special School District is legally responsible for providing special education and related services for children with disabilities who reside in St. Louis County and are eligible for services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and state law as found in Chapter 162 RSMo. During the 2013-14 school year, the district provided special education and related services for more than 21,000 children and youth. Approximately 97% of these children received these services in classrooms in the 265 school buildings of the 22 partner districts in St. Louis County. The services are driven by the IEPs developed for each student. The structure of systems within which the services are delivered in each school district is organized annually in the Partnership Agreements designed by Superintendents of each district and the Superintendent of SSD. SSD also provides educational services in seven school facilities operated directly by SSD.

The delivery of special education is closely coordinated with the staff of the school district in which a child resides. The vast majority of students participate in the general education curriculum offered by their local school district and receive special education services to ensure their access to and progress in the general education curriculum. The general education curriculum supports students in their acquisition of knowledge detailed in the Missouri Common Core State Standards. Approximately 1% of the students receive education services based on alternate standards (educational standards aligned with the Missouri Common Core State Standards but developed for students with the most significant disabilities).

The Board of Education for SSD commissioned the Equity Study, in part, to determine if the special education services are provided in an equitable manner for all eligible students. The study was guided by a set of Essential Questions approved by the Board:

**Special Education/Related Services and Programmatic Offerings – Are the identification patterns of students served by SSD comparable to those of the state? Are high-quality programs, special education services and related services equally available to students with disabilities throughout St. Louis County?**

1. What are the special education identification rates (ECSE and School Age) for the district as a whole and for each of the partner districts, disaggregated by disability, race, gender and poverty (free-and-reduced-lunch eligibility)? How do these data compare to statewide averages?
2. What are the staffing patterns, number of students with disabilities, total service minutes, and students per teacher at the school buildings? Disaggregate these data for each of the partner districts. What are comparable data for teachers serving students assigned to Separate Day facilities?
3. Are the programs and related services of Special School District comparably provided to students in the various partner districts?

**Special Education Outcomes – Do students with disabilities achieve acceptable outcomes with respect to academic achievement and other measures associated with the Performance Categories associated with the IDEA? What factors lead to the higher achievement and better outcomes for students served by SSD?**

1. What are the MAP and EOC data for students served by SSD as a whole and separated by district and school building? Are there differences within this data associated with race, gender, disability and poverty?

2. What are the attendance rates for students with disabilities served by SSD as a whole and disaggregated by district and school building? Are there differences within this data associated with race, gender, disability and poverty?
3. What are the discipline, graduation and dropout rates for students with disabilities served by SSD as a whole and disaggregated by district? Are there differences within this data associated with race, gender, disability and poverty?
4. What are the SAT, ACT, COMPASS and ASVAB data for students served by SSD as a whole and separated by district? Are there differences within this data associated with race, gender, disability and poverty?
5. What are the post-secondary follow-up data for students with disabilities served by SSD as a whole and disaggregated by district? Are there differences within this data for race, gender, disability and poverty?
6. What are the administrative structures, programs or services that contribute to higher performance in identified partner districts?

The BAFC Study Team gathered extensive data and conducted numerous interviews with SSD staff to provide a foundation for this report. The Study Team wishes to specifically acknowledge Dr. Lynne Midyett and members of her staff who provided much of the data to be presented. BAFC Consulting also wishes to acknowledge the data and information provided by Leigh Ann Grant-Engle and her staff at the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE).

## **Special Education/Related Services and Programmatic Offerings**

The initial undertaking of the Study Team was to gather data to obtain a comprehensive picture of the incidence of students with disabilities throughout St. Louis County and the types of services they receive.

### **Identification Rates**

The identification of students with disabilities is governed by eligibility criteria adopted by the State Board of Education in the Missouri State Plan for Special Education, Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The State Plan identifies 13 disabilities. The appendices provide a detailed picture of the data for the state, county and individual districts – Appendix A, Profile Information; Appendix B, Child Count; and Appendix C, Students by Race/Ethnicity.

The IDEA requires two separate counts of children with disabilities: one for Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) and one for school age children and youth. DESE reports a statewide incidence rate for early childhood special education of 0.27% of the 3-21 age group population of Missouri. The incidence rate in St. Louis County is 0.41%. The majority of districts in St. Louis County have incidence rates that are closely aligned with the SSD overall rate of .41%. However, five districts have incidence rates that are significantly higher than SSD overall:

- Brentwood (.52%)
- Normandy (.58%)
- Maplewood Richmond Heights (.62%)
- Bayless (.70%)
- Valley Park (.79%)

Six of the partner districts provide ECSE services in their own early care and education programs with varying incidence rates:

- Rockwood (.30%)
- Mehlville (.32%)
- Kirkwood (.34%)
- Pattonville (.38%)
- Ferguson-Florissant (.59%)
- University City (.80%)

There are some significant variances in incidence rates for ECSE in the County. Those present in the six partner districts that serve their children in partner district programs are outside the purview of SSD to manage. However, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Bayless and Valley Park have significant variances and are a part of the programs administered directly by SSD.

For the school-age population – those children age 5-21 – SSD and the partner districts have identified 21,910 eligible for special education services, an incidence rate of 15.52%. This compares to a statewide incidence rate of 12.64% of all students in Missouri. Eighteen of the 22 partner districts have incidence rates that exceed the state average. Only Normandy, Clayton, Ladue and Maplewood Richmond Heights have incidence rates at or below the state average. Parkway, Pattonville and Jennings have incidence rates of 16.4% or higher, four percentage points higher than the state average.

Similarly, there is considerable variance in the identification of students with specific disabilities. The categories of Intellectual Disabilities, Emotional Disorders, Speech Impaired, Language Impaired, Specific Learning Disabilities and Autism account for more than 80% of all students with disabilities. Within these categories, the data demonstrated considerable variance in identification rates. Normandy, Riverview Gardens, Jennings and Ferguson-Florissant had rates of Intellectual Disabilities that were significantly higher than the county average; while Brentwood, Clayton, Kirkwood, Lindbergh and Webster Groves demonstrated lower. With respect to Specific Learning Disabilities, a lower identification rate was seen for Normandy, Ladue, Clayton, Kirkwood, Lindbergh and Maplewood Richmond Heights; and a significantly higher rate was evident for Rockwood, Mehlville, Parkway, Pattonville and Jennings. Other disability categories did not have a significant variance from the average of SSD as a whole.

Poverty has been documented as a contributing factor to educational disabilities by the U.S Department of Education. In the county, several of the partner districts with poverty rates of 50% or more did demonstrate higher disability incidence rates; including Hancock Place, Bayless, Ritenour, and Riverview Gardens. However, Normandy and Maplewood Richmond Heights had poverty rates of 50% or greater and they demonstrated incidence rates much below the county average. Additionally, some of the highest incidence rates were associated with districts with a poverty rate below 50%, including Parkway and Pattonville.

Another factor analyzed was the representation of students of color in the disability incidence rates. Black students were overrepresented in the disability incidence by 3 percentage points or more in six districts – Affton, Kirkwood, Ladue, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Parkway and Rockwood. Hispanic students were over identified in Brentwood. In Ritenour, Hispanic students were underrepresented.

The incidence of students with disabilities is clearly higher in St. Louis County than the remainder of the state. There can be several factors that contribute to this. It is often said that the quality of the special

education services available from SSD contributes to the higher incidence – parents of students with disabilities move to St. Louis County to allow their children to receive the higher-quality services. Certainly this can be accurate. There may be other factors as well. Clearly, the poverty rate in several of the districts could be a contributing factor. The rigor of the curriculum and the academic expectations of the partner districts may be a factor. Appropriate planning and implementation of differentiated teaching strategies and tiered levels of intervention associated with Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) as present in RTI and PBIS may be a factor. SSD has identified a much higher incidence rate for students participating in the Voluntary Inter-district Choice Corporation (VICC). The factors affecting incidence rates are likely many and varied. While the scope of this review did not allow for a causal analysis of the factors that contribute to the variances; the district may wish to conduct such analyses. When similarly situated districts such as Ladue, Clayton, Lindbergh and Kirkwood can vary markedly from Rockwood, Mehlville and Parkway, such an investigation may be worthwhile.

### **Educational Environments**

The IDEA requires school district to educate students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment. The federal and state education departments have long-standing goals to increase the number of students with disabilities who receive their special education services in the general education classroom. The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education has targeted increases in the percentage of students with disabilities served in the general education classroom for improvement in the IDEA, Part B State Performance Plan filed with the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs.

Federal reporting requirements expect states and school districts to organize educational placement data into four categories. The categories represent the amount of time students with disabilities spend in the regular education classroom to receive their education. The following data present the data for Missouri as a whole and St. Louis County:

**Table 28: Special Education Placement Data for Missouri and St. Louis County**

<b>Placements</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>St. Louis County</b>
Inside the Regular Ed Class > 79%	59.4%	63.4%
Inside the Regular Ed Class 40-79%	25.7%	18.7%
Inside the Regular Ed Class < 40%	9.3%	8.7%
Public Separate Day Facilities	1.2%	3.05%

The countywide data for SSD indicate performance superior to the state as a whole, except for placements in Public Separate Day Facilities. However, SSD has been reducing their reliance on separate education facilities for a number of years. The most recent data available from DESE show that 5.1% of students were placed in Public Separate Day Facilities during the 2010-11 school year and 3.7% during the 2011-12 school year.

The data for the partner districts demonstrate considerable variance with respect to educational placements (See Appendix D). Brentwood, Clayton and Maplewood have more than 80% of their students served in the regular education class greater than 79% of the time; while University City, Normandy and Jennings have fewer than 60% of their students in the general education class greater than 79% of the time. Nine of the partner districts have 70-77% of their students in this category. The data for placements in the category of

“less than 40% of the time in regular class” vary to a substantial degree. Two districts, Valley Park and Normandy, have more than 20% of their students in this category. A total of nine districts have more than 10% of their students in such placements. And yet, six districts have 5% or fewer students in these more segregated placements. Ladue, Clayton and Brentwood have 2% or fewer students in these placements. DESE collects data for the separate public placements at the county level, thus discriminating the placement patterns for individual partner districts is not feasible.

The variance of the education placement data is notable. SSD must request physical space from partner districts to locate classes for children with low incidence disabilities (hearing impairment). Some districts allocate space for such programs while others do not. Certainly this factor could contribute to some of the variance. However the data may also suggest that there may be multiple philosophies influencing the placement of students with disabilities. While the IDEA requires individualized placement decisions based on the needs of the students, it appears partner district philosophy plays a significant role in the decisions. Students in some partner districts have a much greater likelihood of receiving less restrictive placements than students in other partner districts.

### **Staffing Patterns Within Districts**

Special School District employs a total 1,769 individuals as a part of the teaching staff, 1056 paraprofessionals and 191 applied behavior analyst paraprofessionals serving students in the partner districts. These members of the instructional staff receive direct supervision from 67 area coordinators. The appendices provide detailed information regarding these staff and their relative assignments – Appendix E, K-12 Caseload Information and Appendix F, Area Coordinator Numbers.

Appendix E provides information relative to the caseloads of teachers and speech language pathologists serving students in the partner districts. A review of the data suggests there is significant parity in regard to the average number of students assigned to each special education teacher (most total between 28 and 35) and speech language pathologists (most total between 28 and 32). However there are some notable variances. The average student caseload for teachers is 18 in Brentwood and 19 in University City, while Rockwood averages 41. Affton, Lindbergh, Parkway, Pattonville and Valley Park average 35. Regarding speech language pathologists, notable variances were noted for Hazelwood and Ritenour with an average caseload of 40 while Brentwood averages 24.

Providing supportive and appropriate direct supervision for the instructional staff is the responsibility of the 67 area coordinators. Appendix F details the assignments for each of the area coordinators. An average of 26 instructional staff is supervised by one area coordinator. However, there are a number of variances within these data. In Affton, Kirkwood, Lindbergh, Mehlville and Rockwood the area coordinator supervises between 30 and 36 instructional staff; while Brentwood, Hancock, Maplewood and Valley Park area coordinators supervise between 12 and 17 instructional staff.

While the data regarding caseloads and supervision levels are meaningful, they fail to demonstrate a complete analysis. Obviously, some of the variance depicted above is accounted for by virtue of the relative size of the district – Brentwood, Valley Park and Bayless are small school districts. The smaller numbers create what appear to be inefficiencies that in reality are very difficult to manage otherwise. However, another contributor to some of the variance will be the complexity of the programs and services being provided and/or supervised. Clearly there are buildings in which services are organized for students who have more significant need (significant levels of intellectual disabilities, autism, etc.). These services will often require



smaller caseloads and higher levels of supervision. The data reviewed were not sensitive to such variables, and therefore may present a picture that fails to appreciate the complexity of the issues.

The district's computerized IEP system allows the administration to aggregate the number of special education and related service minutes for each student, for the school building, for the partner district and for SSD as a whole. At the aggregate level, SSD provides 2.1 million minutes of special education and related services per week for its students. The district provided data that summarized the number of minutes provided in each school building throughout the county. These data provide a wealth of information for administration to use to achieve equitable staffing of teachers, related service personnel, paraprofessionals and supervisors. The district has developed a "weighted caseload" to report caseloads for its staff.

### **Specialized Programs and Services**

Special School District provides access to specialized programs and services available from commercial companies to respond to the more unique learning and service needs of students with disabilities. Professional development for literacy programs, specialized vocational programs and intensive behavior support systems are offered to SSD and partner district staff to provide students with access to an array of services. Appendix F includes a listing of partner districts that have availed themselves of professional development for specialized literacy services, and listings of partner districts and a count of their students who participate in specialized vocational and behavioral support programs.

Often the need for the training comes about as a result of decisions made in IEP committee meetings. The student may not have responded well to the communication arts curriculum and special education services provided in the district. An assessment of the student's literacy strengths and needs may reveal a need for specialized instruction utilizing modalities not incorporated in the district's curriculum. The IEP committee makes the decision to incorporate unique approaches that are supported by professional development for both SSD and partner district staff. The literacy component of Appendix F lists the various communication arts programs that are used to address such needs and the number of staff in those districts who have received professional development. A total of 1,461 staff has received training over the past three years. The distribution of staff by partner district indicates 20 of the 22 partner districts participated in training relative to one or more of the methodologies; neither Valley Park nor Hancock Place participated in any of the professional development opportunities.

Transition services are a priority for students with disabilities. Data from the National Longitudinal Transition Study I and II (NLTS I and NLTS II) have documented the need for additional support and services for students with disabilities to enhance their ability to successfully transition from school to adult life. Particularly important have been opportunities to develop vocational skills that lead to productive employment in competitive or supported employment. SSD has developed and implemented specialized vocational services as documented in Appendix G(2): Specialized Programs – Vocational Skills Program and Appendix G(3): Specialized Programs – Community-Based Vocational Instruction. The data demonstrate participation by students from all partner districts in the CBVI - a total of more than 500. The distribution of students by district is consistent with the overall number of students in each of the districts. The data for the Vocational Skills Program indicate participation by 95 students from 20 of the 22 partner districts (Hancock Place and Brentwood did not have students included in the program). The Vocational Skills Program involves significantly fewer students but the distribution of students by districts that do participate is consistent with the overall population of students in the districts.

The incidence of autism has risen dramatically across the nation as well as in the St. Louis area. Research has supported early and intensive intervention for students with autism to mitigate the effects of behavioral, social and language delays often present with the disorder. One of the effective practices for students with autism is the use of Applied Behavioral Analysis (ABA). The systematic analysis of behavioral issues and the consistent application of precise interventions are highly effective for some children with autism, while for others more marginal gains are seen. Yet ABA is accepted by rigorous research to be one of the effective treatments for intensive behavioral issues seen in students with autism. The Table in Appendix F presents a summary of the number of students in ECSE and school age programs that are supported with ABA services in the various partner districts. All partner districts are represented and the distribution of the representation is consistent with the overall population of students in the districts.

## Special Education Outcomes

Educational and adult outcomes for students with disabilities have become increasingly important. Since the National Longitudinal Transition Studies I and II (NLTS), the Congress and the U.S. Department of Education have focused on the issue. The NLTS revealed outcomes that were less than expected for students with disabilities when followed for five years after graduation from high school.

The Congress and the U.S. Department of Education have instituted several policy changes that direct increased focus on education results and outcomes. Federal and state monitoring efforts were focused on compliance with the procedural aspects of the law. Data were gathered to determine if evaluations, IEPs, placements, procedural safeguards, etc., were implemented in ways that demonstrated full compliance with the IDEA. Today the U.S. Department of Education has instituted a national conversation to revise their monitoring system to focus on educational results and outcomes, in addition to procedural compliance with the IDEA. Missouri DESE has followed suit and has modified their monitoring efforts to reflect the changes occurring at the federal level.

The present study of equity for the Board of Education of Special School District proposed to measure results and outcomes in the ways outlined in the Essential Questions. This report will detail the findings.

## Communication Arts – MAP and EOC

Overall, students with disabilities in St. Louis County performed better than students with disabilities in districts throughout the state.

**Table 29: MAP and EOC Data for Students with Disabilities**

Area	Participation Rates	Basic & Below	Proficient & Advanced
St. Louis County	99.7%	68.7%	31.3%
Missouri	99.6%	74.8%	25.2%

Following is a summary of each district and their relative performance on the communication arts assessments. The results are disaggregated for socioeconomic status and grade levels. The ratings divide the districts into Top 33%, Middle 33% and Lower 33%.

**Table 30: MAP Communication Arts Scores for SSD Students by Partner District Placement**

**SES – Social Economic Status; F/R – Free/Reduced Lunch; Not F/R – Not Free/Reduced Lunch; MAP Score Categories: BB – Below Basic; B – Basic; P – Proficient; A – Advanced; ELA – English/Language Arts Assessment**

District	SES Not F/R BB/B	SES Not F/R Prof/A dv.	SES F/R BB/B	SES F/R P/A	Grade 3 P/A	Grade 4 P/A	Grade 5 P/A	Grade 6 P/A	Grade 7 P/A	Grade 8 P/A	ELA I P/A	ELA II P/A
Afton	T	T	T	T	M	M	M	T	M	M	T	T
Bayless	L	L	M	M	L	M	L	L	L	T	L	M
Brentwood	T	T	T	T	M	M	M	T	T	T	L**	T
Clayton	T	T	L	L	T	T	T	T	M	T	M	T
Ferg-Flor	M	M	L	L	L	L	L	M	M	L	***	L
Hancock	M	M	T	T	T	T	M	L	L	M	T	M
Hazelwood	L	L	M	M	M	L	M	L	L	L	L	L
Jennings	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	M	M	L	L	L
Kirkwood	T	T	M	M	T	M	T	T	M	T	T	M
Ladue	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	M	T	T	T	T
Lindbergh	T	T	T	T	M	T	T	M	T	T	T	T
Maplewood	M	M	M	M	L	T	L	L	L	M	M	L
Mehlville	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	T	M	M	M
Normandy	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	T*	L
Parkway	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	M	M	T
Pattonville	M	M	T	T	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	T
Ritenour	L	L	L	L	M	L	L	M	M	L	L	L
Riverview	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Rockwood	M	M	M	M	T	T	T	M	T	M	M	T
U City	M	M	L	L	L	L	M	L	L	L	L	M
Valley Park	T	T	T	T	T	M	T	T	T	T	T	M
Webster	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	T	M	M	M	M
SSD	L	L	M	M	T	T	T	T	T	T	M	M

T = Top 33% M = Middle 33% L = Lowest 33% Light Gray = Top in all or most areas Dark Gray = Lowest in all or most areas

All districts scored lower than the Part B Target of 57

\*Normandy reported 50% in Basic, 50% in Proficient

\*\*Brentwood scores not provided

\*\*\* Ferguson-Florissant scores not provided for ELA I

A review of the MAP performance data for communication arts for students with disabilities demonstrated the following:

- Districts with the fewest students scoring at the Basic and Below Basic levels included Ladue, Lindbergh, Clayton, Parkway, Kirkwood, Affton, Brentwood, Valley Park, Rockwood, Webster, Hancock Place, Mehlville and Pattonville.
- Districts with the most students scoring at the Proficient and Advanced levels included Ladue, Lindbergh, Clayton, Valley Park, Parkway, Kirkwood, Affton, Brentwood, Rockwood, Webster, Hancock, Mehlville and Pattonville.
- Districts with the fewest number of black students scoring at the Below Basic and Basic levels included Brentwood, Affton, Lindbergh, Valley Park, Hancock, Ladue and Pattonville.
- Districts with the most black students scoring at the Advanced and Proficient levels included Brentwood, Affton, Lindbergh, Valley Park, Hancock, Ladue and Pattonville.
- Districts with the fewest number of Caucasian students scoring at the Below Basic or Basic Levels included Webster, Valley Park, Lindbergh, Parkway, Kirkwood, Clayton, Ladue and University City.
- Districts with the most number of Caucasian students scoring at the Advanced and Proficient Levels included University City, Ladue, Clayton, Kirkwood, Parkway, Valley Park, Webster and Lindbergh.
- Districts with the fewest students receiving free/reduced lunch scoring at the Below Basic and Basic Levels included Affton, Brentwood, Hancock, Lindbergh, Valley Park, Parkway, Pattonville and Ladue.
- Districts with the most number of students receiving free/reduced lunch scoring at the Proficient/Advanced Levels included Affton, Brentwood, Hancock, Lindbergh, Valley Park, Parkway, Pattonville and Ladue.

A more detailed report of communication arts MAP and EOC data may be viewed in Appendix H. The Appendix will further analyze those districts that performed least well on the MAP assessments and present achievement data disaggregated by grade levels.

## Mathematics MAP and EOC

Overall, students with disabilities performed well in comparison to students with disabilities throughout the rest of the state. Similar to the data for communication arts, the participation rates for students in the mathematics MAP and EOC was high, and students with disabilities in St. Louis County performed slightly higher than students in the state as a whole.

Following is summary of each district and their relative performance on the mathematics assessments. The results are disaggregated for socioeconomic status and grade levels. The ratings divide the districts into Top 33%, Middle 33% and Lower 33%.

**Table 31: MAP Mathematics Scores for SSD Students by Partner District Placement**

District	Particip. Rate	Total MAP	EOC – AI	EOC - GEO	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade7	Grade 8
Afton	Mid	M	M	M	M	M	H	H	M	M
Bayless	Top	M	M	H	L	M	M	M	L	M
Brentwood	Hi	H	H	L	H	L	M	L	H	H
Clayton	Hi	H	H		H	H	H	H	H	H
Ferg-Flor	Mid	L	L		L	L	L	L	L	L
Hancock	Hi	M	M	L	H	H	M	M	L	M
Hazelwood	Mid	L	L	L	M	L	M	M	M	M
Jennings	Mid	L	L	L	M	L	L	L	L	L
Kirkwood	Mid	H	H		H	H	H	H	H	M
Ladue	Hi	M	M	M	H	M	L	M	H	M
Lindbergh	Mid	H	H		H	H	L	H	H	H
Maplewood	Hi	M	M	M	M	H	L	L	M	L
Mehlville	Mid	M	M		L	M	M	M	M	H
Normandy	Hi	L	L		L	L	L	L	L	L
Parkway	Mid	H	H	H	M	H	H	H	M	H
Pattonville	Hi	M	M	H	M	M	M	M	M	M
Ritenour	Mid	L	L	L	L	L	M	L	M	L
Riverview	Low	L	L		L	L	L	L	L	L
Rockwood	Mid	H	H	H	M	H	H	H	H	M
SSD	Mid	H	L		H	H	H	H	H	H
U. City	Mid	L	L	L	L	M	L	L	L	L
Valley Park	Hi	H	H	M	H	M	L	H	H	H
Webster	Hi	M	M		M	M	M	M	M	H

Note: Brentwood was high overall for MAP even though some grades and EOC were low and middle.

Legend: T = Top; M = Middle; L = Low; Light Gray = Top in all or most areas; Dark Gray = Lowest in all or most areas

A review of the mathematics MAP and EOC data for students with disabilities demonstrated the following:

- Districts with the fewest number of students in the Below Basic/Basic Levels of performance included Clayton, Kirkwood, Lindbergh, Parkway, Rockwood and Valley Park.
- Districts with the most number of students in the Advance/Proficient Levels of performance included Brentwood, Clayton, Kirkwood, Lindbergh, Parkway, Rockwood and Valley Park.
- Districts with the fewest number of black students in the Below Basic/Basic Levels included Hancock, Lindbergh, Valley Park, Bayless, Clayton, Kirkwood and Pattonville.
- Districts with the most number of black students in the Advanced/Proficient Levels included Hancock, Lindbergh, Valley Park, Bayless, Clayton, Kirkwood and Pattonville.

- Districts with the fewest number of Caucasian students in the Below Basic/Basic Levels included University City, Lindbergh, Brentwood, Valley Park, Kirkwood, Parkway, Ladue and Rockwood.
- Districts with the most number of Caucasian students in the Advanced/Proficient Levels included Clayton, University City, Lindbergh, Brentwood, Valley Park, Kirkwood, Parkway and Ladue.
- Districts with the fewest number of students receiving free/reduced lunch in the Below Basic/Basic Levels included Lindbergh, Affton, Brentwood, Valley Park, Hancock, Kirkwood, Maplewood and Clayton.
- Districts with the most number of students receiving free/reduced lunch in the Advanced/Proficient Levels included Brentwood, Lindbergh, Kirkwood, Webster, Clayton, Affton and Bayless.

A more detailed report of mathematics MAP and EOC data may be viewed in Appendix H(2). The Appendix will further analyze those districts that performed least well on the MAP assessments and present achievement data disaggregated by grade levels.

### **Discipline/Suspension Rates**

Suspension from school – both in-school and out-of-school – for students with disabilities has been a source of concern for many years. First the courts and then Congress began to provide specific directions to school districts regarding their authority to discipline students with disabilities. Today school districts must follow specific and detailed procedural steps to reach appropriate decisions regarding disciplinary actions for students with disabilities. The U.S. Department of Education requires states to report a good deal of data regarding the disciplinary actions taken by school districts in the states.

Overall the data demonstrates that the partner districts utilize out-of-school suspensions at a rate that is somewhat higher than school districts throughout the state.

**Table 32: Out-of-School Suspension Rates for SSD Students with Disabilities**

<b>Entity</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Ratio</b>
SSD Schools	5.0	.17
Partner Districts	13.84	1.6
State	10.20	1.89

The variance between partner district data and that for the state is notable.

**Table 33: Out-of-School Suspension Rates for Students with Disabilities Served by Partner Districts (# per 100 occurrences)**

<b>Range – top, mid, low</b>	<b># of Partner Districts</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>State</b>
1.96 to 8.33	8		
9.27 to 14.33	7	13.84	10.20
22.35 to 40.58	7		

- Eight (8) partner districts had suspension rates (OSS occurrences per 100) in the top 3<sup>rd</sup> of performance. The suspension rate for these districts ranges from 1.96 to 8.33. (Brentwood – 1.96; Clayton – 4.29; Affton – 5.77; Ladue – 5.92; Rockwood – 6.99; Kirkwood – 7.76; Parkway – 7.94; Mehlville – 8.33.)
- Seven (7) partner districts had suspension rates in the range of 9.27 – 14.33. (Valley Park – 9.27; Pattonville – 9.42; Lindbergh – 9.80; Maplewood Richmond Heights – 13.57; Hancock Place – 14.21; Bayless – 14.29; and Webster Groves – 14.33.)
- Seven (7) partner districts had suspension rates in the range of 22.35 to 40.58. (University City – 22.35; Ferguson-Florissant – 23.86; Hazelwood – 24.37; Ritenour – 24.58; Jennings – 29.65; Normandy – 40.25; and Riverview Gardens – 40.58.)
- Eleven (11) districts had a suspension rate better than the state rate for students with disabilities. The state rate is 10.20 and those districts performing above the state rate are as follows: Brentwood – 1.96; Clayton – 4.29; Affton – 5.77; Ladue – 5.92; Rockwood – 6.99; Kirkwood – 7.76; Parkway – 7.94; Mehlville – 8.33; Valley Park – 9.27; Pattonville – 9.42; and Lindbergh – 9.6.

**Table 34: Racial Breakdown of Rate per OSS more than 10 days per 100 occurrences for students with disabilities**

	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Asian</b>	<b>Pacific Island</b>	<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>Multiracial</b>
Districts with Indicator (rate) better than state average	10	8	19	21	17	19
Range	0 to 12.5	0 to 21.43	0 to 20	0 to 50	0 to 8.33	0 to 7.46
State	6.0	1.1	.8	3.1	1.4	2.1

(Data is from Sped. Profile reports and differs in that is for only those more than 10 days OSS.)

- The rate-per-occurrence for students who are white ranged from 0 to 12.5 with 10 districts having rates better than the state average of 1.1. (Affton – 1.06; Clayton – 0.45; Kirkwood – 0.56; Ladue – 0.99; Mehlville – 0.71; Pattonville – 1.03; Riverview Gardens – 0; Rockwood – 0.92; University City – 0; Valley Park – 0.)
- The rate-per-occurrence for students who are black ranged from 0 to 21.43 with 8 districts having rates better than the state average of 6. (Brentwood – 0; Clayton – 0; Jennings – 4.33; Kirkwood – 5.4; Ladue – 3.61; Mehlville -3.68; Pattonville – 3.26; Hancock Place – 5.71.)
- The rate-per-occurrence for students who are Asian ranged from 0 to 20 with 19 districts having rates better than the state average of 0.9. Note that only 3 districts reported suspensions in this area.
- The rate-per-occurrence for students who are Pacific Islander ranged from 0 to 50 with 21 districts having rates better than the state average of 3.1. Only one district reported suspensions in this area.
- The rate-per-occurrence for students who are Hispanic ranged from 0 to 7.46 with 17 districts having rates better than the state average of 1.4. Note that only 6 districts reported suspensions in this area.
- The rate-per-occurrence for students who are Multi-racial ranged from 0 to 7.46 with 19 districts having rates better than the state average of 2.1. Note that only three districts reported occurrences in this area.

## Graduation Rates

The National Longitudinal Transition Study (NLTS) documented that students with disabilities have had a much lower rate of graduation than other students. The U.S. Department of Education has required states to establish goals to increase the graduation rate since the reauthorization of the IDEA in 2004.

The following provides an overall summary of the graduation data for the 22 partner districts.

**Table 35: Graduation Rates for Students with Disabilities by Partner District Placement**

**Sped 4 yr – 4 year Graduation Cohort; Sped 5 yr – 5 Year Graduation Cohort; Special Education – 6-Year Graduation Cohort**

	<b>Sped 4 yr County &amp; State 76%</b>	<b>Sped 4 Yr District</b>	<b>Sped 5 Yr County 72%</b>	<b>Sped 5 Yr State 80%</b>	<b>Sped 5 Yr District</b>	<b>Sped 6 Yr County 85%</b>	<b>Sped 6 Yr State 77%</b>	<b>Sped 6 Yr District</b>	<b>All Students State 86%</b>	<b>All Students District</b>
Afton	>	T	>	>	T	<	>	L	>	M
Bayless	<	L	>	>	T	>	>	T	>	M
Brentwood	>	T	>	>	T	<	>	M	>	T
Clayton	>	T	>	>	T	>	>	T	>	T
Ferg-Flor	<	L	<	<	L	<	<	L	<	L
Hancock	>	T	>	>	T	<	>	M	>	T
Hazelwood	<	L	>	<	L	<	>	M	>	L
Jennings	>	T	>	>	T	>	>	M	>	M
Kirkwood	>	T	>	>	M	>	>	T	>	T
Ladue	>	T	>	>	T	>	>	T	>	T
Lindbergh	>	M	<	<	L	<	>	L	>	M
Maplewood	>	M	>	>	M	>	>	T	>	M
Mehlville	>	M	>	>	M	>	>	T	>	M
Normandy	<	L	<	<	L	<	<	L	<	L
Parkway	>	M	>	>	M	>	>	T	>	M
Pattonville	<	L	>	<	L	<	>	L	<	L
Ritenour	<	L	>	<	L	<	>	L	<	L
Riverview	<	L	>	<	L	>	>	M	<	L
Rockwood	>	M	>	>	M	>	>	T	>	M
U. City	>	M	>	<	M	<	>	M	<	L
Valley Park	>	T	>	<	M	<	>	L	>	T
Webster	>	M	>	>	T	>	>	T	>	T

T = Top 33% M = Middle 33% L = Lowest 33% < Less Than > Great Than Light Gray = Top in all or most areas Dark Gray = Lowest in all or most areas



Students with disabilities graduate at a rate of 76.0% in four years in school districts throughout the state. In St. Louis County the rate is 76.36%, but there is considerable variance in the graduation rates for students with disabilities in partner districts.

- Districts with graduation rates of 87% or higher include Clayton, Brentwood, Kirkwood, Hancock, Affton, Ladue, Valley Park and Jennings.
- Districts with a graduation rate between 77% and 86% include Parkway, University City, Rockwood, Webster, Lindbergh, Maplewood Richmond Heights and Mehlville.
- Districts with a graduation rate between 53% and 75% include Hazelwood, Pattonville, Riverview, Bayless, Ritenour, Ferguson-Florissant and Normandy.

The Missouri DESE also collects data from districts for a 5-year cohort and a 6-year cohort for graduation. The aggregate data for the state and the St. Louis County for the two additional cohorts are:

**Table 36: Special Education 5-Year Cohort Graduation Rates**

St. Louis County	71.82%
Missouri	79.73%

**Table 37: Special Education 5-Year Cohort Graduation Rates by District**

> St. Louis County – 71.82%	19 districts
< St. Louis County – 71.82%	3 districts
> Missouri – 79.73%	13 districts
< Missouri – 79.73%	9 districts

**Table 38: Special Education 6-Year Cohort Graduation Rates**

St. Louis County	85.07%
Missouri	77.49%

**Table 39: Special Education 6-Year Cohort Graduation Rates by District**

86.56% - 100.00%	9 districts
82.65% - 85.56%	6 districts
72.86% - 82.28%	7 districts

## Dropout Rates

Like graduation rates, the NLTS documented the dropout rates for students with disabilities to be generally higher than for students in general. The IDEA 2004 requires states and local school districts to collect data on the dropout rates and establish goals to improve the statistic for students with disabilities. Dropout data for Missouri indicates the following:

**Table 40: Special Education Dropout Rates**

St. Louis County	3.03%
Missouri	4.20%

**Table 41: Districts Above and Below County and State Dropout Rate Averages**

> St. Louis County – 3.03%	15 districts
< St. Louis County – 3.03%	7 districts
> Missouri – 4.20%	16 districts
< Missouri – 4.20%	6 districts

The variance of dropout data for Partner Districts is significant.

**Table 42: Special Education Dropout Rates in St. Louis County by District**

0.00% - 0.71%	8 districts
1.41% - 2.58%	7 districts
3.07% - 18.32%	7 districts

- Districts that report less than 1% of their students as dropouts include Clayton, Brentwood, Hancock, Valley Park, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Ladue, Affton and Kirkwood.
- Districts reporting between 1% and 3% include Parkway, Rockwood, Mehlville, Lindbergh, Jennings, Webster and Pattonville.
- Districts reporting between 3% and 18% include Hazelwood, Ritenour, University City, Bayless, Riverview, Ferguson-Florissant and Normandy.

## Post-Secondary Follow-Up Data

IDEA 2004 and the standards for MSIP 5 require school districts to track students with disabilities to determine their level of employment, continuing education or military service after graduation from high school. Policy makers observed that the adult outcomes for students with disabilities were less, in some cases significantly less, than their counterparts in general education. IDEA requires goals to be set at the state and local levels to improve results and outcomes for students who received special education services. Missouri DESE has established a set of data that is collected annually from school districts to track outcomes.

The data reported by school districts are, for the most part, self-reported data. Data collected by the school districts come from questionnaires completed by the student or his/her family or from interviews with the graduate or family member.

The following tables present an aggregate picture for St. Louis County:

**Table 43: St. Louis County, Served by SSD as a Whole: Post-Secondary Follow-up Data**

<b>Percent of Students with Disabilities – St. Louis County</b> <b>Higher Ed; Competitively Employed/Military; Non-Competitively Employed/Non-College</b> <b>or Non-Advanced Training; &amp; Other</b>				
Higher Ed	Comp Empl & Military	Non-comp Empl/NCT	Other	IEP Grads
50.3%	16.9%	4.0%	28.7%	1861

**Table 44: Disaggregated by District: Post-Secondary Follow-up Data**

<b>Percent of Students with Disabilities by District</b> <b>Higher Ed; Competitively Employed/Military; Non-Competitively Employed/Non-College</b> <b>and Non-Advanced Training; &amp; Other</b>				
Range	Higher Ed	Comp Empl & Military	Non-comp Empl/ NCT	Other
>75 %	4%	0	0	0
25% to 75%	16%	0	0	12%
< 25%	2%	23%	23%	11%

- Normandy and Riverview reported less than 25% of students enrolled in higher education.
- Districts that reported 25% to 75% of students enrolled in higher education included Affton, Bayless, Brentwood, Ferguson-Florissant, Hancock, Hazelwood, Jennings, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Mehlville, Parkway, Pattonville, Ritenour, Rockwood, University City, Valley Park and Webster.
- Districts that reported >75% enrolled in higher education included Clayton, Kirkwood, Ladue and Lindbergh.

These data can be disaggregated by race/ethnicity as follows:

**Table 45: St. Louis County Students with Disabilities, Disaggregated by Ethnicity**

<b>St. Louis County IEPs – Ethnicity</b> <b>Higher Ed; Competitively Employed/Military; Non-Competitively Employed/Non-College</b> <b>and Non-Advanced Training; &amp; Other</b>				
IEP Grads	Higher Ed	Comp Empl & Military	Non-comp Empl/NCT	Other
Not Asian or White	43.8%	16.6%	4.9%	34.7%
Asian or White	57.7%	17.3%	3.0%	22.1%

The aggregate data on graduate follow-up are also available in a format that disaggregates for gender.

**Table 46: St. Louis County Students with Disabilities, Disaggregated by Gender**

<b>St. Louis County Students with Disabilities – Gender</b> <b>Higher Ed; Competitively Employed/Military; Non-Competitively Employed/Non-College</b> <b>and Non-Advanced Training; &amp; Other</b>				
<b>IEP Grads</b>	<b>Higher Ed</b>	<b>Comp Empl &amp; Military</b>	<b>Non-comp Empl Cont Ed</b>	<b>Other</b>
Females	57.3%	12.7%	4.3%	25.8%
Males	46.2%	19.5%	3.8%	30.5%

**Table 47: St. Louis County Female Students with Disabilities by Partner District**

<b>St. Louis County Female Students by Partner District</b> <b>Higher Ed; Competitively Employed/Military; Non-Competitively Employed/Non-College</b> <b>and Non-Advanced Training; &amp; Other</b>				
<b>Range</b>	<b>Higher Ed</b>	<b>Comp Empl &amp; Military</b>	<b>Non-comp Empl/NCT</b>	<b>Other</b>
>75 %	3 districts	1 district	0	0
25% to 75%	19 districts	5 districts	2 districts	13 districts
< 25%	1 districts	17 districts	21 districts	10 districts

**Table 48: St. Louis County Male Students with Disabilities by Partner District**

<b>St. Louis County Male Students by Partner District</b> <b>Higher Ed; Competitively Employed/Military; Non-Competitively Employed/Non-College</b> <b>and Non-Advanced Training; &amp; Other</b>				
<b>Range</b>	<b>Higher Ed</b>	<b>Comp Empl &amp; Military</b>	<b>Non-comp Empl/ NCT</b>	<b>Other</b>
>75 %	5 districts	0	0	0
25% to 75%	14 districts	6 districts	0	12 districts
< 25%	4 districts	17 districts	23 districts	11 districts

The data represented in these tables suggest that 75% of females and 70% of males are enrolled in higher education or competitively employed. The majority of the remainder is unknown. These data are self-reported by the student or the family member.

A more detailed report of the graduate follow-up data is presented in Appendix I – Post-School Outcomes. Data in the appendix is further disaggregated by individual disabilities. Those data suggest that students with hearing impairments, language impairments, speech impairments and physical disabilities demonstrate better post-secondary outcomes than students with other disabilities.

## **Policy Options and Recommendations**

The Equity Study Team has reviewed the data provided by the district and by DESE. As reported below, there are several elements of district services that may benefit from additional review and analysis. BAFC Consulting is aware that SSD has committed itself to quality improvement strategies including data analysis, joint team reviews with partner district and Special School District personnel, establishment of improvement targets with metrics for appropriate measurement, etc. The Board and Administration may find it beneficial to utilize the existing quality infrastructure to review the findings of this report, conduct additional analyses to identify causal factors, and identify practices that support higher and more equitable performance and outcomes. With such data, SSD and partner districts may be able to strategically implement improvement strategies that support improvements for students with disabilities in each of the partner districts and achieve more equitable results.

Based on the information provided, the Study Team offers the following policy options and recommendations for consideration by the Board and Administration:

1. The incidence rates for students with disabilities are higher in St. Louis County than for the state as whole. Further, the incidence rates for children and youth with disabilities vary from district to district both for ECSE and for school-age students. In some instances the variance is substantial. There is variance in the rates for specific disabilities. There are some districts that have a high incidence of poverty but a lower-than-average incidence of disabilities. Alternately, there are some districts with lower incidences of poverty but higher-than-average incidences of disability. The Board and Administration may find it beneficial to review the data reported and determine if further study and changes may be necessary.
2. The placement of students with disabilities in the Least Restrictive Environment is an important function of IEP Committees. A review of the data suggests there is considerable variance between the partner districts in the level of placement afforded to students. Some districts rely heavily on inclusive placements while others on restrictive placements. Some districts welcome students from other districts who have low incidence disabilities, while others do not. The patterns suggest the philosophy of the partner districts result in notable differences in the level of special education placements offered for students with disabilities. The Board and Administration may find it beneficial to review the placement patterns identified in this report to determine if it is appropriate and beneficial to achieve more commonality between districts with respect to placement patterns.
3. The findings regarding staffing patterns identified some variance regarding teacher/related service staffing levels and area coordinators' supervision caseloads. The Study Team did not have information regarding the level of disability of students served by the teachers nor the intensity of the programs and services to judge if variances were responsive to student needs. The Study Team is aware that a similar finding was offered by the Gibson Study. Based on the Gibson Report, the district has established a teacher and related services workload committee to develop and test a staffing model that is sensitive student needs.
4. The section of this report that details student outcomes identified several areas that the Board and Administration may wish to explore further. Of note to the Study Team was the Special Education Program Evaluation recently presented to the Board by the Administration. The results of the Program Evaluation and the observations made in this report complement one another in many respects. There

are questions identified with respect to suspension, graduation and dropout data that deserve further review and analysis by the Board and Administration. Educational results as measured by the MAP and EOC examinations contained a high degree of commonality between the Special Education Program Evaluation and the data reported in this study. Of particular note were students from those districts that consistently performed better than others; and the relationship between the MAP and EOC scores for students with and without disabilities.

The outcome data suggest another area for further study. There is a notable gap between outcome data for students with disabilities who are Caucasian and those who are students of color or those living in poverty. Notable gaps are present in most of the partner districts, even those with the highest levels of achievement. While such a gap is a national phenomenon as well, researchers and educators have begun to identify policies and practices that are proving to be more effective in addressing the educational needs for these important groups of students. The Board and Administration may wish to consider formation of specific improvement groups to investigate this area further and implementation of strategies that will improve results.

Given the expectation that students with disabilities receive special education and related services to enhance their ability to access the general education curriculum, there may be opportunities for collaborative efforts with partner districts to enhance the structure and strength of the general education curriculum and services necessary to support the learning of all students. Concepts such as Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) may be of interest to explore to strengthen the efficacy of instruction for all students, and thereby improve the instruction for students with disabilities as well. The data strongly suggest the educational results for students with disabilities are closely associated with educational results for all students in the partner district. If this is so, one group of students may not be substantially improved without improving the other.

## Section III: Career and Technical Education (CTE)

Special School District of St. Louis County has two primary responsibilities – to provide special education services for children and youth ages 3 – 21 with disabilities who reside in the school districts of St. Louis County and to provide career and technical education (CTE) for students electing to receive such services who are enrolled in the school districts of St. Louis County. The district’s CTE programs are primarily located at North Technical High School and South Technical High School. As will be documented later, the district offers a wide array of CTE programs for students, most of which meet industry standards and have achieved certifications. Several of the partner districts also offer CTE programs that are primarily focused on science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) fields. The partner district programs will not be included in this study.

The review of CTE programs was guided by the Essential Questions approved by the Board of Education. For each of the Essential Questions, the Study Team specified additional questions that provided clarity for their inquiries:

### **Career and Technical Education – Do students served by the CTE programs of Special School District receive industry-accredited services and achieve outcomes that support further career education or job placement? Are programs and services provided by SSD comparable to those of other suburban areas in the state?**

1. How do North and South Technical High Schools compare with respect to program offerings, enrollment requirements and enrollment? This data should be disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender and disability.
  - 1a. How do North and South Technical High Schools compare with respect to program offerings?
  - 1b. How does the application process and admissions requirements compare for North and South Tech?
  - 1c. How do North and South Tech compare as far as enrollment?
2. How do students enrolled in the technical high schools perform with respect to EOC data, dropout and graduation data, program completion data, measures of industry standards, and placement/continuing education data? These data should be disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender and disability.
  - 2a. How do students enrolled in North and South Tech CTE programs compare in relation to EOC data?
  - 2b. How successful are students from North Tech as compared to South Tech in terms of achieving graduation requirements?
  - 2c. How successful are students from North Tech as compared to South Tech in terms of program completion and/or certification?
  - 2d. How successful are students from North Tech as compared to South Tech in terms of achieving post-secondary goals?
3. What CTE programs are partner districts providing? What planning processes and supports from Special School District are in place to assess and support the development of CTE programs in partner districts? What are the student outcomes (as identified in #2 above)?
  - 3a. What CTE programs of study are partner districts currently providing?

- 3b. What planning processes and/or supports do SSD have in place for the development and assessment of CTE programs in partner districts?
- 4. How do SSD programs and outcome data, as identified in #1 and #2 above, compare to CTE programs in other suburban areas of the state?
  - 4a. How do outcomes and program data from SSD's CTE programs compare to other comparable suburban CTE programs in the state?

### **Programs and Enrollment at North and South Technical High Schools**

Decisions regarding CTE programs offered at both North Tech and South Tech are driven by assessments of area labor/job demands and by student interests as measured by enrollments. District data indicates that North Tech offers a total of 28 programs with 8 of these offered at North Tech only. South Tech offers a total of 26 programs with 6 of these offered at South Tech only. Single site offerings are the result of student interest/enrollments. While there are 14 programs that are unique to one of the schools, students may choose to enroll for a program that is outside of their catchment area.



**Table 49: Career and Technical Program Offerings for 2013-14 School Year**

<b>Programs</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>South</b>	<b>Off Campus</b>
Auto Body	•	•	
Automotive Technology	•	•	
Broadcast Captioning & Court Reporting		•	
Career Exploration	•		
Carpentry	•	•	
Cosmetology	•	•	
Culinary Arts	•	•	
Dental Sciences		•	
Diesel Technology	•		
Early Childhood Education	•	•	
Electrical Trades	•	•	
Electronics & Robotics Engineering		•	
Emergency Medical Technical	•	•	
Fashion Design	•	•	
Business & Financial Management	•		
Firefighting	•	•	
Floor Layers Middle Apprenticeship		•	Bayless
Graphic Design	•	•	
Graphic Production & Print	•		
Construction Trades	•	•	
Architectural Design & Engineering	•		
Health Sciences	•	•	
Homeland Security	•	•	
Hospitality, Tourism & Event Planning	•		
Heating, Ventilation & Air Conditioning	•	•	
Laboratory & Pharmacy Sciences		•	
Law Enforcement	•	•	
Motorcycle & Small engine Technology		•	
CISCO Networking Academy	•	•	
Plumbing	•		
Precision Machining	•	•	
Veterinary Assistant	•	•	
Web & Computer Programming	•	•	
Welding	•	•	

### **Applications and Admissions Process**

The SSD Career and Technical Education handbook provides information regarding the Board-approved application process for admission to the two schools. It is a standardized process applied to both schools. Information and procedures relative to the process are presented at each of the partner district sending high schools. The data reviewed by the Study Team indicated the procedures and admission standards are the same at both schools.

The process includes both large and small group presentations designed to inform students about CTE programs, provide an overview of both North and South Technical High Schools, and generate interest in the programs and opportunities afforded to students. The presentations are made available to all students

throughout St. Louis County at agreed upon grade levels/times. Group tours are also available for those districts that choose to access them.

Data from a previous study commissioned by the district – The CTE Focus Group Study – corroborated the procedures described in the handbook and quality of the presentations, based on feedback from representatives from the high schools who participated in the focus groups.

The application process includes some generic information and requirements expected for each of the CTE programs available to the students. Some CTE programs have unique requirements, such as specific coursework required to be eligible for the CTE program. Students are informed about the generic as well as unique application processing requirements. Applications and documentation once received are then forwarded by the admissions representatives to the CTE Central Office for review.

In addition to the required application and documentation process, the admissions representatives attempt to meet with all applicants for the purpose of providing an overview of the CTE program and the requirements for program admission. There are no written or stated criteria for what makes a student eligible/ineligible in terms of attendance, discipline and transcript documentation. Total credits earned and pre-requisite coursework are included in the guidelines as eligibility requirements for some but not all of the program areas. All students who apply are notified by mail and via the website on admissions status. There is an appeal process for students denied acceptance.

Students with disabilities who apply for admission to one of the technical high schools undergo an additional review conducted by an “Instructional Facilitator”. The students’ IEP are reviewed to determine the type and intensity of services required by the students. The CTE Focus Group Study documented concerns by a number of partner district high school personnel that students with higher levels of special education minutes or who required more extensive modifications or accommodations were often denied admission to the technical high school.

Appendix A outlines data regarding those students who were denied admission to either North or South Technical High Schools. To summarize the data, the following observations are offered:

- 50 of the 91 denials were based on the student’s special education needs as documented in the IEP – 55% of all denials
- 35 of the 91 denials were due to insufficient credits – 38% of all denials
- 3 of the 91 denials were due to behavior/discipline problems – 3 % of all denials
- 5 of the 91 denials were due to insufficient credits and behavior/discipline problems – 5% of all denials
- In total, 62% of the denials were students of color, 36% were white, 2% Other  
At North, 32 were students of color, 4 students were white, and 1 student was Alaskan  
At South, 27 were students of color, 29 students were white, and 1 student was Asian

### **Student Enrollments**

Appendix B provides detailed information regarding enrollment of students in the various programs at North and South Technical High Schools. At North Technical High School approximately 1,038 students enrolled in the school in 2011. The vast majority of the students were students of color – 868, Asian – 4, and Caucasian – 150. Two hundred and seven (207) were students with disabilities representing 20% of the

student population. By far, the most popular programs in which students enrolled were Career Exploration, Construction and Health Sciences. Appendix B provides a detailed look at the distribution of students in the other career programs.

In 2012, North Tech enrolled 1,047 students. Again the vast majority were students of color (881), followed by Caucasian (147) and Asian (4). Students with disabilities represented 16% of the student population.

The following tables summarize the more extensive data in Appendix B:

## **NORTH TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL ENROLLMENT SUMMARY: OCT. 1, 2011**

**Table 50: North Tech High Student Enrollment by Gender (Oct. 1, 2011)**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Female	522	51%
Male	510	49%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.032</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 51: North Tech High Student Enrollment by Gender and Race (Oct. 1, 2011)**

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Number of Male Students</b>	<b>Number of Female Students</b>
Asian	2	2
Hispanic	2	3
Pacific	0	2
Black	391 (38% of total student body)	467 (45% of total student body)
Indian	2	1
White	113 (11% of total student body)	47 (5% of total student body)
<b>Total</b>	<b>510</b>	<b>522</b>

**Table 52: North Tech High School Special Education Students by Gender (Oct. 1, 2011)**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>	<b>Percent of Total Student Body</b>
Female Special Education Students	61	6%
Male Special Education Students	146	14%
<b>Total</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>20%</b>

## **NORTH TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL ENROLLMENT SUMMARY: OCT. 1, 2012**

**Table 53: North Tech High Student Enrollment by Gender (Oct. 1, 2012)**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Female	533	52%
Male	485	48%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1018</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 54: North Tech High Student Enrollment by Gender and Race (Oct. 1, 2012)**

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Number of Male Students</b>	<b>Number of Female Students</b>
Asian	1	3
Hispanic	3	2
Pacific	0	0
Black	380 (37% of total student body)	481 (47% of total student body)
Indian	1	0
White	100 (10% of total student body)	47 (4% of total student body)
<b>Total</b>	<b>485</b>	<b>533</b>

**Table 55: North Tech High School Special Education Students by Gender (Oct. 1, 2012)**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>	<b>Percent of Total Student Body</b>
Female Special Education Students	52	5%
Male Special Education Students	114	11%
<b>Total</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>16%</b>

South Technical High School enrolled a total of 851 in 2011 and 900 students in 2012. The majority of the students were Caucasian, followed by students of color and Asian. At South Tech, 13% of the students were identified as students with disabilities. At South the two most popular programs were Automobile Technology and Career Exploration.

## **SOUTH TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL ENROLLMENT SUMMARY: OCT. 1, 2011**

**Table 56: South Tech High Student Enrollment by Gender (Oct. 1, 2011)**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Female	388	59%
Male	271	41%
<b>Total</b>	<b>659</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 57: South Tech High Student Enrollment by Gender and Race (Oct. 1, 2011)**

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Number of Male Students</b>	<b>Number of Female Students</b>
Asian	15	10
Hispanic	9	3
Pacific	0	0
Black	58 (7% of total student body)	96 (11% of total student body)
Indian	0	3
White	306 (36% of total student body)	159 (19% of total student body)
<b>Total</b>	<b>388</b>	<b>271</b>

**Table 58: South Tech High School Special Education Students by Gender (Oct. 1, 2011)**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>	<b>Percent of Total Student Body</b>
Female Special Education Students	87	10%
Male Special Education Students	181	21%
<b>Total</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>31%</b>

## SOUTH TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL ENROLLMENT SUMMARY: OCT. 1, 2012

**Table 59: South Tech High Student Enrollment by Gender (Oct. 1, 2012)**

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Female	408	45%
Male	497	55%
<b>Total</b>	<b>905</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 60: South Tech High Student Enrollment by Gender and Race (Oct. 1, 2012)**

Race/Ethnicity	Number of Male Students	Number of Female Students
Asian	20	11
Hispanic	9	7
Pacific	1	2
Black	75 (8% of total student body)	146 (16% of total student body)
Indian	1	0
White	391 (43% of total student body)	242 (27% of total student body)
<b>Total</b>	<b>497</b>	<b>408</b>

**Table 61: South Tech High School Special Education Students by Gender (Oct. 1, 2012)**

Gender	Number of Students	Percent of Total Student Body
Female Special Education Students	33	4%
Male Special Education Students	82	9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>13%</b>

The study team also reviewed data regarding student participation in each of the programs provided at North and South Technical High Schools. For comparison purposes, the various course offerings were grouped into eight career areas (plus career exploration):

**Table 62: Career and Technical Education Course Groupings**

Advanced Manufacturing	Arts/Comm	Info/Tech	Construction	Human Services	Sciences	Public Safety	Transportation
Certified Production Technician	Archit. Des	Bus. Fin.	Carpentry	Cosmetology	Health Serv.	EMT	Auto Body
Precision Machining	Fashion Design	CISCO	Construction Trades	Culinary Arts	Landscaping/Horticulture	Firefighting	Auto Technology
Welding	Graphic Design	Hospitality/Tourism	Electrical Trades	Early Childhood	Yard Maintenance	Homeland Security	Diesel
	Graphic Production	Web/Computer Program.	HVAC			Law Enforcement	

**Table 63: North Technical High School Compiled Data by Major 2012-2013**

<b>Major</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Asian</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>Indian</b>	<b>Pacific</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Spec. Ed.</b>
Advanced Manufacturing	29 male 2 female		16 male 1 female				13 male 1 female	9 male 1 female
Arts & Communication	46 male 50 female		41 male 46 female				6 male 4 female	12 male 12 female
Business Info & Technology	46 male 31 female		33 male 29 female	1 male			12 male	8 male
Construction	90 male 4 female		58 male 2 female				9 male 1 female	19 male
Human Services	21 male 113 female	1 female	19 male 108 female				2 male 4 female	4 male 14 female
Medical, Plant & Animal Sciences	15 male 151 female	1 female	15 male 127 female	1 female			24 female	2 male 6 female
Public Safety	28 male 33 female		15 male 28 female				13 male 7 female	3 male 5 female
Transportation	71 male 6 female		51 male 6 female				18 male 2 female	14 male
Career Exploration	128 male 163 female	1 female	104 male 158 female	1 male			23 male 4 female	34 male 12 female

**Table 64: South Technical High School Compiled Data by Major 2012-2013**

<b>Major</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Asian</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>Indian</b>	<b>Pacific</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Spec. Ed.</b>
Advanced Manufacturing	86 male 4 female	5 male	4 male 1 female	4 male			70 male 3 female	15 male
Arts & Communication	17 male 22 female	1 female	3 male 5 female	1 female			15 male 14 female	5 male 3 female
Business Info & Technology	40 male 3 female	2 male	2 male	1 male			35 male 4 female	8 male
Construction	84 male 5 female		21 male	1 male	1 male		54 male 2 female	25 male
Human Services	26 male 142 female	3 female	7 male 55 female	3 female		2 female	19 male 73 female	4 male 16 female
Medical, Plant & Animal Sciences	27 male 171 female	6 male 4 female	4 male 39 female	2 female			17 male 122 female	3 male 13 female
Public Safety	52 male 11 female	1 male	4 male 1 female				43 male 11 female	3 male
Transportation	113 male 4 female	5 male 1 female	16 male 1 female	2 male			90 male 3 female	16 male
Career Exploration	47 male 26 female	1 male 1 female	10 male 15 female	1 male			35 male 7 female	4 male

In summary the admission standards, enrollment procedures and programs were very comparable when comparing North and South Technical High Schools. The main difference between the two schools related to full-day and half-day programs. Programs offered at North Technical High School were primarily full-day programs, while those offered at South Technical High School are all half-day programs. There appears to be no pedagogical basis for this difference. The structure of the programs at North is a reflection of the student enrollments; therefore they reflect the choices made by those students and their parents.

A second observation relates to the relative participation in Advanced Manufacturing and Career Exploration between the two schools. Since other program enrollments do not have the significant difference represented in these two areas, the Study Team notes these differences and offers policy options / recommendations in that section of this report.

### **Outcome Data**

The Study Team requested extensive data regarding the performance of students enrolled in CTE programs. The District maintains data for those students who are enrolled in full-day programs enrolled in North Tech. However, the district maintains no End-of-Course (EOC) data for those at South Tech. These data are reported to DESE by the partner districts. Those students are not identified as CTE students in the partner district reports. Special School District does maintain graduation and follow-up data for students who qualified to be identified as “Concentrators” in CTE programs participating in either full-day or half-day programs. A concentrator is defined as a student who has earned 1.5 credits in a specific vocational program and has graduated from high school.

Appendix C provides a summary of the End-of-Course (EOC) data. This data reflects performance of students at North Tech. There is no data to report for students at South Tech because these students enroll for only a half-day. Therefore they do not take academic classes at South Tech but rather at their home high school.

The communication arts data at North Tech demonstrates that approximately 70% of the students score at the Proficient or Advanced levels. These scores are comparable to those attained by students throughout the state. In mathematics, the data demonstrates between 28% and 30% of the students score at Proficient or Advanced. Unlike the communication arts data, the mathematics scores are not comparable to the scores for students throughout the state.

Another measure of the outcomes in CTE programs is the percent of students who earn sufficient credits to be designated as a “concentrator” and who subsequently graduate from high school. The following tables present data for students enrolled in SSD programs at North and South Technical High Schools.



## TABLES FOR FOLLOW-UP, GRADUATION AND PLACEMENTS

### Key

**Concentrator/Graduate:** Student enrolled in vocational program, 1.0 (state requirement) or (1 ½ at Tech; 1 sem.) units of credit in vocational program and graduates from high school.

**ER** Employed Related    **ENR** Employed Not Related    **CER** Continuing Ed. Related

**CENR** Continuing Ed. Not Related    **MR** Military Related    **MNR** Military Not Related    **NA** Not Available

### Follow-Up/Graduation & Placement

Concentrator/Graduate: Students enrolled in vocational program, 1.0 (state requirement) or (1 ½ at Tech; 1 sem.) units of credit in vocational program and graduates from high school.

**Table 65: North Technical High School Full-Day Student Data**

	Concentrator/ Graduates	ER	ENR	CER	CENR	MR	MNR	NA	OTH	UNK	TOTAL PLC	MSIP %
2013	222	14	24	122	26	16	3	3	7	9	205	191
		6%	11%	55%	12%	7%	1%	1%	3%	4%	92%	86%
2012	220	22	22	88	65	8	2	2	3	8	207	185
		10%	10%	40%	30%	4%	1%	1%	1%	4%	94%	84%
2011	217	24	9	99	68	7	0	2	2	6	207	197
		11%	4%	46%	31%	3%	0	1%	1%	3%	95%	91%

### Follow-Up/Placement

Concentrator/Graduate: Students enrolled in vocational program, 1.0 (state requirement) or (1 ½ at Tech; 1 sem.) units of credit in vocational program and graduates from high school.

**Table 66: North Technical High School Half-Day Student Concentrator/ Graduates**

	Concentrator/ Graduates	ER	ENR	CER	CENR	MR	MNR	NA	OTH	UNK	TOTAL P	MSIP%
2013	483	45	34	215	71	27	9	1	13	68	401	367
		9%	7%	45%	15%	6%	2%	0%	3%	14%	83%	76%
2012	524	41	55	165	144	15	8	3	24	69	428	373
		8%	10%	31%	27%	3%	2%	1%	5%	13%	82%	71%
2011	555	40	39	201	161	19	3	4	18	70	463	424
		7%	7%	36%	29%	3%	1%	1%	3%	13%	83%	75%

**Table 67: South Technical High School Half-Day Student Concentrator/Graduates**

	<b>Concentrator/ Graduates</b>	<b>ER</b>	<b>ENR</b>	<b>CER</b>	<b>CENR</b>	<b>MR</b>	<b>MNR</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>OTH</b>	<b>UNK</b>	<b>TOTAL P</b>	<b>MSIP%</b>
2013	469	53	60	187	123	7	10	4	13	12	440	380
		11%	13%	40%	26%	1%	2%	1%	3%	3%	54%	81%
2012	461	31	68	190	130	7	8	4	10	13	434	366
		7%	15%	41%	28%	2%	2%	1%	2%	3%	94%	79%
2011	503	50	47	200	159	6	6	6	11	18	468	421
		10%	9%	40%	32%	1%	1%	1%	2%	4%	93%	84%

This data suggests comparable outcomes for students attending North and South Technical High Schools.

### **CTE Programs Offered by the Partner Districts**

CTE programs are not offered by all partner districts, however each district may do so. Those that offer such programs do so in response to the unique interests and needs of students in their district. Often these programs fall into the category of Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) careers. After consulting with Superintendent Cary, the BAFC Study Team removed this element of the Equity Study. These programs are not a part of the Special School District CTE effort and as such do not contribute to nor detract from the equitable distribution of CTE programs and services of Special School District.

### **Comparison with Other Suburban CTE Programs**

The BAFC Study Team chose to gather data from other CTE programs in Missouri serving suburban areas as comparisons for the SSD programs. Data was gathered from Area Career and Technical Schools serving school districts in Jackson, Clay, Platte, Buchanan, and Greene Counties. The results indicate some differences with respect to enrollments and outcomes.

With respect to enrollments, the SSD programs appear to serve a much higher percentage of students of color and students with disabilities than do their counterparts in other areas of the state.

**Table 68: Ethnicity and Disability Comparisons of SSD's CTE Programs and CTE Programs offered in other Suburban Areas of Missouri**

	<b>North Total / %</b>	<b>South Total / %</b>	<b>SSD Consortium Total / %</b>	<b>All Suburban Consortiums Total / %</b>
Total			3798 / 100	19571 / 100
Male			1992 / 52	9824 / 50
Female			1806 / 48	9747 / 50
Black			2043 / 53.8	1709 / 8.9
White			1562 / 41.1	16242 / 83.0
Hispanic			58 / 1.5	620 / 3.2
Asian			64 / 1.7	332 / 1.7
Pacific Islander			5 / 0.1	52 / 0.3
Indian			5 / 0.1	110 / 0.6
Multi Race			61 / 1.6	306 / 1.6
Other/Unknown			0 / 20	0 / 0
Ind. w. Dis.			764 / 20.1	1465 / 7.5

With respect to MAP performance, the data demonstrates lower performance for students from SSD than the suburban counterparts (Note: The SSD data shown below is for North Technical High School only. As was stated previously in this report, MAP data for students attending South Technical High School is not available because all students at South Tech are half-day students and their MAP data is reported via the totals from each of the partner districts.)

**Table 69: North Technical High School 2013 MAP – Communication Arts Scores**

<b>Category</b>	<b>North CTE</b>	<b>Statewide Suburban CTE</b>
Top Two Performance Levels	66.7%	74.7%
State Performance Adjusted Levels	57.9%	57.9%
Comparison To State Adjusted Levels	8.8%	17.0%

**Table 70: North Technical High School 2013 MAP – Mathematics Scores**

<b>Category</b>	<b>North CTE</b>	<b>Statewide Suburban CTE</b>
Top Two Performance Levels	28.6%	55.4%
State Performance Adjusted Levels	58.6%	58.6%
Comparison to State Adjusted Levels	-20%	-3.2%

The Federal Perkins compliance reporting compares local academic performance to State Performance Adjusted Levels of academic performance. The State Performance Adjusted Levels are Missouri benchmarks determined by negotiation between DESE and the USDE. The data measure the percentage of CTE concentrators who score in the top two achievement levels of the respective End-of-Course (EOC) assessment and left secondary education during the reporting year. The EOC for communications arts is English II and for mathematics the EOC is Algebra I.

The communication arts data for North Tech show a positive gain above the state adjusted benchmark but below the statewide suburban CTE results.

The mathematics data for North are much lower than the statewide benchmark and other statewide suburban CTE districts.

As noted above, the MAP data for SSD includes only North Technical High School. Because of this, these data are not a full representation of the academic performance levels of students attending CTE programs in St. Louis County, and a comparison with the Statewide Suburban CTE programs should not be made, or at least should be guarded.

**Table #71: North Technical High School 2013 Technical Skills Attainment (TSA)**

<b>Category</b>	<b>North Technical</b>	<b>South Technical</b>	<b>Statewide Suburban</b>
#Taking TSA	462	307	1525
# Passing TSA	346	246	1087
% Passing TSA	74.8%	80.1%	71.2%
Comparison State Adjusted levels	11.8%	17.1%	8.2%

Technical Skill Attainment (TSA) is a Federal Perkins Core Indicator of Performance. Each year DESE negotiates the adjusted levels of performance with the U.S. Department of Education. The TSA data is comprised of 100% of all CTE concentrators that complete an approved CTE program. Successful completion of a TSA assessment in the students' area of CTE concentration indicates entry-level academic and technical competence.

The North Tech and South Tech data both reflect positive TSA performance when compared to the State Adjusted Levels of Performance and other Statewide Suburban District performance on this measure.

## Policy Options and Recommendations

The following policy options and/or recommendations are offered to the Board of Education and the Superintendent for consideration:

1. The programs, offerings and enrollment procedures are highly similar at North and South Technical High Schools. When course offerings differ, the difference is a function of the enrollment of students in the different programs. If students in one catchment area desire a program that is only offered at the other school, the student is able to enroll in the other school program.

The unavailability of full-day programs at South Technical High School is one of the primary differences between the two schools. Since district policy enables students to enroll in the school outside their catchment area, the lack of full-day programs at South does not appear to be an issue of equity.

The data suggests there is a substantial difference in the enrollment of students in two programs offered at both North Tech and South Tech – Advanced Manufacturing and Career Exploration. Significantly more students enroll in Advanced Manufacturing at South Tech and significantly more students enroll in Career Exploration at North Tech. Career Exploration provides general career information and exploration, but not education and training in specific career options.

The administration may wish to conduct studies with students to determine the basis for this difference and determine if changes in career counseling and guidance in course selection may be necessary.

2. The EOC data for students at South CTE was not available because these students take their academic coursework at their home high school. If these data would be useful to SSD for program evaluation or program planning purposes, the district may wish to establish a procedure whereby the data could be obtained from the partner districts for use by SSD.
3. Students with disabilities account for slightly more than 20% of the total enrollment in the CTE programs. In the suburban CTE programs included in the comparison charts, students with disabilities comprise slightly more than 7%. However members of the Equity Task Force expressed some dissatisfaction with the availability of CTE programs for students with disabilities. Statewide, IDEA eligibility for special education is approximately 12.6%. The availability of CTE programs for students with disabilities is a concern on a statewide basis, while in St. Louis County there appear to be almost three times the percentage in CTE programs.

While there is an over-representation of students with disabilities in the SSD programs in comparison with other suburban areas of the state, there is a demand for even more options to serve students with disabilities. The relatively lower participation of students with disabilities statewide may well be a reflection of a change in federal policy that occurred several years ago in a reauthorization of the Perkins Act. Federal funds once dedicated to special populations (students who live in poverty, students with disabilities, ESL students, etc.) were reprioritized in the federal legislation.

The administration may wish to determine if CTE programs for students with disabilities may be expanded. While federal funds may be limited and unavailable for such an expansion, the need for such programs has been expressed in the present study as well as a previous study referenced as the CTE Focus Group Study.

4. Student participation in CTE programs has been a topic of interest and study in St. Louis County for a number of years. School leaders have desired to expand the number of students participating in the CTE programs. This interest has contributed to the decision of several school districts to initiate their own CTE programs (primarily STEM programs) within their own districts. However, SSD does not have ready access to information regarding the specific programs the districts have developed nor the number of students who have enrolled. There does not appear to be an entity collecting or coordinating such information.

The administration may wish to engage in discussion with leadership in the partner districts to designate a process by which data on all such programs may be collected and information disseminated countywide. Decisions regarding further program development, sharing of program resources, enrollment options, etc., may evolve from such analysis.

## Section IV: Equity in Contracting and Purchasing

Special School District of St. Louis County (SSD) was formed as a result of a vote of the people in St. Louis County to organize a special school district for the purpose of providing special education and vocational education for students who reside in St. Louis County (Chapter 162.815 RSMo). Today the district provides special education and career and technical education for more than 24,000 students. The enrollment places the district in the top ten districts in the state based on the number of students served. The district is a complex organization with broad responsibilities.

SSD is governed by a seven-member Board of Education that is appointed by the Governing Council. The Governing Council is comprised of members of the Boards of Education of the 22 school districts in St. Louis County (Chapter 162.856 RSMo).

The SSD Board of Education commissioned the Equity Study to include a review of the business functions of the district to ensure that the district conducts its business functions in an equitable manner. This report specifically reviews the degree to which contracting and purchasing practices provide equal opportunity for Minority Based Enterprises (MBEs) and Women Based Enterprises (WBEs). The review of the business functions was guided by a set of Essential Questions approved by the Board.

### **Contracting and Purchasing – Are Special School District procedures sufficiently open and transparent to encourage participation by minority and women contractors across the various business functions of the district?**

1. Do the business policies and procedures of the district address/encourage minority and women participation?
2. What have other suburban and urban school districts done to encourage minority and female businesses to contract with them?
3. What impact does in-state verse out-of-state contracting have on minority and female participation?
4. What impact does union verses non-union contracts have on minority and female participation?
5. How are minority and female contractors currently reflected in the contracts and services provided to the district?

Based on conversations with the SSD officials, the following statements were developed to further clarify the areas of inquiry expected of the BAFC Team:

1. Document the district's current (including the previous three years) contracts for services and companies from which the district purchases supplies and equipment to determine the number of such enterprises whose principal owners are minorities and females.
2. Document the administrative procedures used by the district to solicit bids for services, supplies and equipment.
3. Document policies and procedures used by other public entities accountable to statutory requirements for bidding and auditing to attract minority- and female-owned businesses.
4. Identify data and issues that impact equity relative to contracting and purchasing.
5. Present options for the district to consider for improvements.

As the Study Team worked with SSD officials, additional, more specific, questions were developed:

- How does SSD define “equity”?
- What does it mean for a business to be “Minority Owned” or “Woman Owned”?
- Does consideration of “union” versus “non-union” affect the issue of equity and, if so, which consideration takes priority?
- What is SSD’s practice/policy regarding use of in-state versus out-of-state vendors/contractors?
- What efforts are currently being made by SSD to address issues of equity in the areas of purchasing and contracting?
- Does SSD have a goal or target for MBE/WBE participation?
- Given the hundreds of vendors utilized by SSD, it would be extremely time-consuming and expensive to review ALL vendors. What “threshold” should be used to identify a representative sample of vendors?

### **Review Process**

The Study Team met with senior leadership associated with the business and financial services of the district, including Mr. Rich Carver, SSD Chief Financial Officer; Mr. John Ruzas, SSD Director of Purchasing, Materials Management and Print Services; and Mr. Tony George, SSD Purchasing Agent. SSD officials were very helpful and provided information and several documents, including:

- District policies
- Applicable Missouri statutes
- Written administrative programs/practices
- Hazelwood School District policy
- Sample bid packages
- Specific data requested by senior consultants
- Verbal explanations and clarifications for BAFC Consulting Team

The Study Team and SSD representatives reviewed several SSD Board Policies and Missouri statutes, including:

- Policy DJC “Bidding Requirements”
- Policy DJD “Local Purchasing”
- Policy DJF “Purchasing”
- Policy DJG “Vendor Relations”
- RSMO 177.086 “School Property and Equipment – Construction of facilities, sealed bids and public advertisement required, when ... ”
- RSMO 171.181 “School Operations – Preference given Missouri products in making purchase ... ”
- RSMO 8.289 “State Buildings and Lands – Agency using services to be furnished statement of firm’s qualifications and performance data ... ”
- RSMO 8.679 “State Building and Lands – Contract required, procedure to solicit proposals, advertising required in county where work located, open bidding ... ”
- RSMO 34.073 “State Purchasing and Printing – Missouri Businesses, performance of jobs or services, preference, when ... ”



The Team also reviewed “The State of Minority- and Women-Owned Business Enterprise: Evidence from Missouri” - MODOT, August 2012.

During the review process, BAFC consultants were informed that SSD administration had already developed the “Minority and Women Business Program” and had begun to initiate practices outlined in the program. This program was modeled after the “Hazelwood School District Diversity Program”.

### **Previous Policies and Practices**

Until recently, SSD’s practices with regard to contracting and purchasing did little to actively promote participation by Minority- and Women- Based Enterprises; however, to be fair, these practices also did nothing to knowingly prohibit or discourage participation by MBEs and WBEs. Equity with regard to contracting and purchasing was essentially a non-issue and was not being monitored.

The Study Team initiated the study with a review of past contracts and major purchases to assess the degree of participation by MBEs and WBEs. The team also reviewed contracts related to major construction projects completed between December 2010 and May 2011. These contracts combined for a total value of \$1,939,068 and were awarded to eight separate contractors. The team also reviewed the MBE/WBE status of all vendors with whom SSD spent \$100,000 or more in Fiscal Year 2013. This included thirty-seven 37 vendors representing a total of \$25,030,000 in annual expenditures. While there were dozens more vendors doing business with SSD, it was not practicable or financially responsible to review all vendors. The vendors and contractors reviewed provide an adequate and representative sample from which to draw conclusions relative to this study.

Contractors and vendors were compared to lists and information regarding MBEs and WBEs maintained by the following groups:

- Missouri Regional Certification Committee
- St. Louis Development Corporation/Airport Authority
- Missouri State Certification
- Women’s Business Enterprise National Council
- Personal knowledge of SSD administration

It was found that none of the eight construction contractors were MBE or WBE. It was also found that only two of the 37 vendors were WBE and none of the 37 vendors were MBE.

### **The Minority and Women Business Program**

Special School District administrators recently developed and have begun to implement the “Minority and Women Business Program.” This program currently is focused on construction projects/contracts with a value of \$100,000 or more. The program is based on a program currently utilized in the Hazelwood School District that includes construction contracts and several other business and purchasing elements.

The program identifies several principles to be addressed:

- To achieve equal opportunity for MBEs/WBEs to perform construction projects on behalf of the district.

- To ensure that the district does not deny equal opportunity of participation to firms conducting business with the district because of race or gender.
- To outline steps to be taken by the superintendent through designated employees of the district to promote throughout the district the fulfillment of the district's MBE/WBE policies.

The SSD Minority and Women Business Program defines an MBE/WBE as, "A business enterprise which is at least 51 percent owned by one (1) or more minority or women individuals or, in the case of a corporation, at least 51 percent of the stock is owned by one (1) or more minority or women individuals and whose management and daily business operations are independently controlled by one (1) or more minority/women owners." Furthermore, a firm must be certified by one of the following agencies:

- Missouri Regional Certification Committee
- St. Louis Development Corporation/Airport Authority
- Missouri State Certification
- Women's Business Enterprise National Council

The program requires the superintendent or designee to develop and maintain a reporting system to provide continuous monitoring and evaluation of all construction contracts let by the district. The program also establishes an MBE/WBE combined goal of 15% and this goal is included in bid documents that contractors are now required to use when submitting bids for construction projects. Contractors who cannot meet the 15% goal must provide an acceptable explanation of why the goal was not attainable. Failure by a contractor to meet the 15% goal or provide an acceptable written explanation will result in the contractor's bid being deemed non-compliant.

In addition to actions outlined in the Minority and Women Business Program, the district is also now advertising for bids in publications that are typically monitored by MBE/WBE contractors/vendors. District officials have also begun to gradually expand the program to include the selection of vendors for large purchases.

### **Additional Factors that Impact Ability to Select MBEs and WBEs**

Ensuring appropriate participation by MBEs and WBEs is important; however, there are other factors that must be considered by district officials when awarding contracts. These factors must be considered for practical and, in some cases, legal reasons.

Missouri law requires public entities, such as school districts, to accept the best bid submitted. State law also requires, in some instances, that preference be given to Missouri businesses. If the district were to award a contract to a contractor whose bid is not compliant with bid specifications or whose bid is not the "best bid", then another contractor could have basis for legal action under state law.

From a purely practical perspective, some products used by the district, such as HVAC controls and computer technology, are secured from "sole-source providers." These sole-source providers may or may not be MBE or WBE. Another practical consideration is that sometimes there simply are no MBE/WBE contractors/vendors (for example, purchase of school buses).

Any contractor who desires to enter into a contract with the district must provide a bond to protect the district's interests and to ensure that all work will be completed in a timely and workmanlike manner. Some

businesses are unable to submit bids because they cannot secure, from a private Surety, a bond of sufficient value required by the project.

Furthermore, when considering all bids submitted by potential contractors, the district must consider factors such as references and/or past performance of the contractor/vendor, the contractor's/vendor's years of experience, and whether the contractor/vendor has sufficient manpower to meet the obligations of the contract.

### **Policy Options and Recommendations**

Special School District is wise to address the issue of participation by MBEs and WBEs. While the district could allocate considerable time and resources to review past practices, it seems to be generally accepted that MBE/WBE participation was not monitored in the past and actual participation by MBE/WBE contractors and vendors was minimal. Most importantly, because actual participation by MBE/WBE contractors is sometimes difficult to guarantee, the district would be wise to focus on maximizing opportunities and removing barriers to participation by MBEs/WBEs.

In addition to steps already taken, the following policy options/recommendations are offered for consideration:

1. The district should continue to address this issue as an administrative program rather than a formal, Board-adopted policy. As outlined in this report, district administrators must consider multiple factors when awarding contracts under competitive bids. In the event a decision was challenged alleging over-emphasis or under-emphasis of one or more of these factors, the Board would be able to review the decision and take appropriate action. This opportunity for appeal to the Board would help to minimize the possibility of potential legal action.
2. Recent efforts in the area of construction represent an excellent step toward ensuring participation by MBEs and WBEs. The district should continue to implement the Minority and Women Business Program as designed. District administrators should continue to monitor MBE/WBE participation in construction projects and develop an annual report to be submitted to the Superintendent.
3. The district should expand the Minority and Women Business Program to monitor participation of MBE/WBE vendor participation with regard to major purchases. Specifically, any purchase arrangement that is secured by contract and valued at \$100,000 or more should be subject to program conditions similar to those now applied to construction contracts.
4. As the district seeks to expand the Minority and Women Business Program in the future, whether by administrative action or Board action, it is imperative that the district utilizes and follows the advice of legal counsel.
5. When preparing bids/contracts, the district should consider breaking up large contracts into multiple, smaller contracts to the degree that is reasonable to do so. MBEs and WBEs are sometimes smaller companies with a lower capacity to bid on public contracts.

6. When preparing bid specifications, the district should carefully consider bonding requirements to ensure that these requirements are set no higher than is necessary to protect the district's interest. Lower bonding requirements will exclude fewer small MBEs and WBEs from participation.
7. The district should take steps to ensure prompt payment to contractors. Furthermore, the district should encourage prompt payment by contractors to subcontractors. Small MBEs and WBEs often cannot function without prompt payment.
8. The district should begin to maintain a list of MBE and WBE contractors and vendors in a variety of areas. In the future, the district could share this list of potential subcontractors with prime contractors to help them meet the district's MBE/WBE participation goals.
9. If the district learns of a MBE or WBE that is not properly certified as defined in the Minority and Women Business Program, the district should encourage the MBE/WBE to become certified so that it might be considered by the district in the future.

## APPENDIX A: SPECIAL EDUCATION PROFILE REPORT

**Table 1A: Profile Information**

DESE#	State, County or District	Student Enrollment K-12 (#)	Incidence Rate (%)	IEP Students (#)	Free & Reduced Lunch (%)	Attendance Rate (%)	Dropout Rate (%)	Grad Rate (%)	Suspension Rate/ Disabled	Suspension Rate/Non- disabled	Suspension Rate Ratio
	Missouri	888,208	12.64%	112,250	49.9%	94.4%	4.20%	76.36%	10.20	5.40	1.89
	STL County	141,130	15.52%	21,910			3.03%	76.00%	13.84	8.63	1.6
096109	Normandy	4,510	10.47%	472	91.7%	88.7%	18.32%	52.63%	40.25	22.84	1.76
096106	Ladue	3,978	11.46%	456	11.8%	95.8%	0.53%	93.75%	5.92	2.04	2.9
096102	Clayton	2,504	11.54%	289	15.2%	96.0%	0.00%	100.00%	4.29	1.41	3.05
096107	Maplewood	1,134	12.08%	137	50.1%	98.5%	0.00%	81.82%	13.57	6.58	2.06
096093	Lindbergh	5,874	12.68%	745	18.7%	96.0%	2.30%	83.33%	9.80	3.26	3.01
096092	Kirkwood	5,281	12.71%	671	16.4%	94.7%	0.71%	98.36%	7.76	1.82	4.28
096112	U. City	3,016	12.77%	385	66.3%	92.0%	6.43%	85.71%	22.35	16.95	1.32
096103	Hancock	1,476	12.87%	190	78.1%	95.8%	0.00%	95.00%	14.21	5.93	2.39
096101	Brentwood	772	13.21%	102	30.0%	94.9%	0.00%	100.00%	1.96	2.54	0.77
096099	Bayless	1,574	13.34%	210	61.0%	94.8%	6.76%	62.50%	14.29	9.54	1.5
096110	Ritenour	6,188	13.41%	830	77.1%	93.9%	4.47%	60.87%	24.58	17.04	1.44
096111	Riverview	5,931	13.88%	823	93.4%	93.4%	6.84%	73.21%	40.58	32.14	1.26
096114	Webster	4,369	14.21%	621	19.3%	95.6%	2.51%	84.91%	14.33	2.11	6.79
096088	Hazelwood	17,882	14.28%	2,554	57.2%	94.4%	3.07%	75.00%	24.37	13.44	1.81
096089	Ferg-Flor	11,261	14.29%	1,609	72.0%	93.7%	11.38%	53.73%	23.86	15.82	1.51
096091	Rockwood	22,018	14.56%	3,205	15.2%	95.8%	1.73%	84.94%	6.99	2.25	3.1
096094	Mehlville	10,679	14.61%	1,560	29.1%	94.9%	1.81%	77.36%	8.33	2.86	2.91
096113	Valley Park	1,014	14.89%	151	47.5%	95.9%	0.00%	87.50%	9.27	5.01	1.85
096098	Afton	2,403	15.15%	364	42.4%	94.5%	0.68%	94.29%	5.77	1.69	3.41
096095	Parkway	17,274	16.41%	2,835	20.3%	94.5%	1.41%	85.83%	7.94	2.53	3.14
096090	Pattonville	5,563	16.41%	913	47.2%	95.2%	2.58%	75.00%	9.42	5.04	1.87
096104	Jennings	2,508	16.95%	425	87.3%	92.4%	2.35%	86.96%	29.65	18.70	1.59
096119	SSD	3,921	60.27%	2,363	50.9%	81.8%	0.76%	36.44%	5.00	29.12	0.17

Source: DESE Special Education Profile Reports 9/13

## APPENDIX A: SPECIAL EDUCATION PROFILE REPORT

**Table 2A: District Dropout/Graduation Rate Compared to Special Education Dropout/Graduation Rate**

DESE #	State, County or District	District Dropout Rate (%)	Special Education Dropout Rate (%)	District Graduation Rate (%)	Special Education Four-Year Graduation Cohort Rate (%)	Special Education Five-Year Graduation Cohort Rate (%)	Special Education Six-Year Graduation Cohort Rate (%)
	Missouri	2.4%	4.20%	85.68%	76.36%	79.73%	77.49%
	STL County				76.00%	71.82%	85.01%
096098	Affton	1.6%	0.68%	90.32%	94.29%	84.78%	81.08%
096099	Bayless	2.7%	6.76%	86.57%	62.50%	84.62%	100.00%
096101	Brentwood	0.4%	0.00%	96.83%	100.00%	100.00%	83.33%
096102	Clayton	0.0%	0.00%	99.52%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
096089	Ferg-Flor	5.9%	11.38%	77.52%	53.73%	62.07%	75.43%
096103	Hancock	0.0%	0.00%	96.49%	95.00%	90.00%	85.19%
096088	Hazelwood	2.1%	3.07%	85.66%	75.00%	76.33%	82.65%
096104	Jennings	2.6%	2.35%	87.41%	86.96%	89.66%	85.07%
096092	Kirkwood	0.4%	0.71%	98.31%	98.36%	82.93%	94.67%
096106	Ladue	0.5%	0.53%	97.83%	93.75%	87.18%	97.56%
096093	Lindbergh	1.1%	2.30%	91.85%	83.33%	67.86%	82.05%
096107	Maplewood	0.6%	0.00%	89.61%	81.82%	82.35%	88.89%
096094	Mehlville	1.1%	1.81%	93.59%	77.36%	81.08%	87.37%
096109	Normandy	24.0%	18.32%	56.94%	52.63%	57.14%	72.86%
096095	Parkway	1.1%	1.41%	93.16%	85.83%	83.06%	90.28%
096090	Pattonville	2.5%	2.58%	84.16%	75.00%	72.34%	82.28%
096110	Ritenour	3.7%	4.47%	70.07%	60.87%	71.83%	82.22%
096111	Riverview	6.5%	6.84%	68.47%	73.21%	71.76%	86.21%
096091	Rockwood	1.0%	1.73%	94.32%	84.94%	83.26%	86.56%
096112	U City	4.8%	6.43%	85.42%	85.71%	78.95%	83.05%
096113	Valley Park	0.7%	0.00%	95.12%	87.50%	77.78%	80.00%
096114	Webster	0.8%	2.51%	96.27%	84.91%	85.45%	90.57%

Source: DESE District Report Card and DESE Special Education Profile Reports 9/13

## APPENDIX B: SPECIAL EDUCATION CHILD COUNT

**Table 1B: Child Count Incidence Rate**

DESE#	State, County or District	MR/ID	ED	SI	LI	OI	VI	HI	SLD	OHI	D/B	MD	AU	TBI	YCDD	Total
	Missouri	1.12%	0.70%	2.23%	1.15%	0.06%	0.50%	0.13%	3.48%	2.27%	0.00%	0.17%	0.96%	0.05%	0.27%	12.64%
	STL County	1.11%	1.11%	2.54%	1.52%	0.08%	0.03%	0.18%	3.78%	2.72%	0.00%	0.25%	1.75%	0.04%	0.41%	15.52%
096109	Normandy	1.69%	1.00%	1.15%	0.93%	0.02%	0.00%	0.02%	2.22%	1.73%	0.00%	0.09%	1.02%	0.02%	0.58%	10.47%
096106	Ladue	0.60%	0.48%	1.84%	1.03%	0.13%	0.05%	0.25%	2.69%	1.78%	0.00%	0.03%	2.31%	0.03%	0.25%	11.46%
096102	Clayton	0.32%	0.60%	2.40%	0.92%	0.00%	0.08%	0.04%	2.56%	2.28%	0.00%	0.16%	2.08%	0.00%	0.12%	11.54%
096107	Maplewood	0.71%	0.71%	2.03%	1.41%	0.09%	0.00%	0.00%	2.73%	1.68%	0.00%	0.35%	1.76%	0.00%	0.62%	12.08%
096093	Lindbergh	0.37%	1.06%	2.45%	1.07%	0.07%	0.02%	0.07%	2.03%	3.32%	0.00%	0.07%	1.92%	0.02%	0.22%	12.68%
096092	Kirkwood	0.53%	0.74%	1.99%	1.69%	0.19%	0.04%	0.11%	3.39%	1.72%	0.00%	0.19%	1.76%	0.02%	0.34%	12.71%
096112	U City	0.99%	1.03%	1.29%	1.99%	0.03%	0.07%	0.00%	3.18%	1.99%	0.00%	0.03%	1.36%	0.00%	0.80%	12.77%
096103	Hancock	0.68%	0.54%	2.24%	1.56%	0.00%	0.00%	0.07%	2.85%	2.64%	0.00%	0.20%	1.63%	0.07%	0.41%	12.87%
096101	Brentwood	0.26%	0.65%	1.81%	1.17%	0.00%	0.00%	0.39%	3.89%	2.59%	0.00%	0.13%	1.81%	0.00%	0.52%	13.21%
096099	Bayless	0.57%	0.95%	2.22%	1.97%	0.06%	0.06%	0.00%	2.54%	2.54%	0.00%	0.13%	1.59%	0.00%	0.70%	13.34%
096110	Ritenour	1.20%	1.16%	2.38%	1.52%	0.02%	0.00%	0.13%	3.07%	2.00%	0.00%	0.13%	1.45%	0.06%	0.29%	13.41%
096111	Riverview	2.19%	1.08%	1.85%	1.55%	0.08%	0.03%	3.00%	3.44%	2.28%	0.00%	0.05%	0.76%	0.03%	0.49%	13.88%
096114	Webster	0.39%	1.46%	2.20%	1.33%	0.05%	0.07%	0.11%	3.23%	3.04%	0.00%	0.07%	1.92%	0.02%	0.32%	14.21%
096088	Hazelwood	1.43%	1.00%	2.24%	1.63%	0.05%	0.02%	0.15%	3.71%	2.28%	0.00%	0.16%	1.15%	0.06%	0.41%	14.28%
096089	Ferg-Flor	1.79%	1.07%	2.05%	1.62%	0.07%	0.04%	0.04%	3.50%	2.15%	0.00%	0.17%	1.16%	0.04%	0.59%	14.29%
096091	Rockwood	0.47%	0.57%	2.85%	1.36%	0.08%	0.03%	0.15%	4.59%	2.71%	0.00%	0.09%	1.34%	0.04%	0.30%	14.56%
096094	Mehlville	0.56%	0.98%	2.42%	1.67%	0.13%	0.04%	0.16%	3.20%	3.13%	0.00%	0.21%	1.77%	0.03%	0.32%	14.61%
096113	Valley Park	0.69%	1.38%	2.37%	1.38%	0.00%	0.00%	0.10%	4.24%	2.66%	0.00%	0.10%	1.18%	0.00%	0.79%	14.89%
096098	Afton	0.83%	1.04%	3.70%	0.83%	0.00%	0.08%	0.08%	4.00%	2.41%	0.00%	0.08%	1.79%	0.00%	0.29%	15.15%
096095	Parkway	0.63%	0.90%	2.37%	1.57%	0.08%	0.02%	0.42%	4.24%	3.31%	0.01%	0.20%	2.16%	0.03%	0.48%	16.41%
096090	Pattonville	0.72%	1.19%	2.95%	1.74%	0.09%	0.02%	0.11%	4.33%	3.13%	0.00%	0.09%	1.65%	0.02%	0.38%	16.41%
096104	Jennings	2.55%	1.12%	2.75%	1.63%	0.00%	0.00%	0.04%	4.86%	2.59%	0.00%	0.08%	0.96%	0.12%	0.24%	16.95%
096119	SSD	6.78%	7.68%	9.64%	2.78%	0.26%	0.05%	1.25%	8.93%	7.86%	0.00%	4.54%	9.49%	0.23%	0.79%	60.27%

Source: DESE Special Education Profile Reports 9/13

## APPENDIX C: SPECIAL EDUCATION CHILD COUNT BY ETHNICITY

**Table 1C: Students by Race/Ethnicity**

DESE #	State, County or District	Total White (K-12) %	Total IEP White (3-21) %	Total Black (K-12)	Total IEP Black (3-21) %	Total Hispanic (K-12) %	Total IEP Hispanic (K12) %	Total Other - Asian, Indian, Pacific Islander, Multiracial - (K-12) %	Total IEP Other - Asian, Indian, Pacific Islander, Multiracial - (K-12) %
	Missouri	73.71%	73.60%	16.59%	18.60%	5.12%	4.02%	4.58%	3.78%
	STL County	52.49%	53.51%	37.22%	38.71%	3.45%	2.96%	6.84%	4.82%
096098	Aftton	79.78%	78.02%	7.37%	10.99%	4.70%	3.30%	8.15%	7.69%
096099	Bayless	70.90%	72.38%	12.39%	14.76%	2.60%	1.90%	14.11%	10.96%
096101	Brentwood	65.41%	63.73%	22.15%	23.53%	3.76%	7.84%	8.68%	4.90%
096102	Clayton	65.73%	68.98%	18.69%	20.46%	3.31%	2.97%	12.27%	7.59%
096089	Ferg-Flor	14.24%	17.10%	78.24%	77.24%	2.42%	1.76%	5.10%	3.90%
096103	Hancock	70.05%	66.32%	17.28%	18.42%	4.95%	4.21%	7.72%	11.05%
096088	Hazelwood	23.87%	26.42%	72.04%	70.51%	2.05%	1.59%	2.04%	1.48%
096104	Jennings	0.60%	1.88%	99.16%	97.88%	0.16%	0.00%	0.08%	0.24%
096092	Kirkwood	77.16%	68.29%	14.20%	21.71%	2.69%	2.89%	5.95%	7.11%
096106	Ladue	63.45%	66.67%	15.66%	18.20%	4.40%	3.51%	16.49%	11.62%
096093	Lindbergh	86.36%	87.25%	4.53%	5.64%	2.71%	2.82%	6.40%	4.29%
096107	Maplewood	56.97%	54.29%	31.83%	37.14%	3.62%	1.43%	7.58%	7.14%
096094	Mehlville	82.40%	82.51%	8.39%	9.57%	3.04%	2.99%	6.17%	4.93%
096109	Normandy	1.42%	1.69%	96.81%	97.03%	1.15%	0.85%	0.62%	0.43%
096095	Parkway	64.84%	66.03%	14.87%	20.11%	4.64%	4.80%	15.65%	9.06%
096090	Pattonville	54.93%	58.42%	31.57%	30.76%	7.68%	6.41%	5.82%	4.41%
096110	Ritenour	39.66%	46.02%	39.01%	40.36%	14.59%	7.83%	6.74%	5.79%
096111	Riverview	1.33%	2.67%	96.86%	95.87%	0.54%	0.24%	1.27%	1.22%
096091	Rockwood	80.20%	78.51%	9.92%	13.75%	2.48%	3.21%	7.40%	4.53%
096112	U City	12.57%	12.47%	82.49%	84.94%	2.32%	0.94%	2.62%	1.65%
096113	Valley Park	61.93%	66.89%	22.68%	19.21%	5.92%	5.30%	9.47%	8.60%
096114	Webster	74.27%	61.19%	18.72%	32.05%	2.11%	1.77%	4.90%	4.99%
096119	SSD	53.48%	56.62%	41.34%	37.75%	1.63%	1.88%	3.55%	3.75%

Source: DESE Special Education Profile Reports 9/13



## APPENDIX D: SPECIAL EDUCATION PLACEMENT REPORT

**Table 1D: K-12 Educational Environments**

DESE #	State, County or District	Student Enrollment K-12 (#)	Incidence Rate (%)	IEP Students (#)	Inside Regular Class >79% (%)	Inside Regular Class 40-79% (%)	Inside Regular Class 40% (%)	Public Separate (Day) Facility (%)	Parentally Place Private School (%)	State Operated Separate School (%)
	Missouri	888,208	12.64%	112,250	59.40%	25.79%	9.33%	1.24%	1.99%	0.92%
	STL County	137,209	15.52%	21,910	63.44%	18.79%	8.75%	3.05%	4.96%	NA
096098	Afton	2,403	15.15%	364	71.43%	18.13%	10.44%	0.00%	0.00%	NA
096099	Bayless	1,574	13.34%	210	68.57%	26.19%	5.24%	0.00%	0.00%	NA
096101	Brentwood	772	13.21%	102	82.35%	16.67%	0.98%	0.00%	0.00%	NA
096102	Clayton	2,504	11.54%	289	83.74%	14.19%	2.08%	0.00%	0.00%	NA
096089	Ferg-Flor	11,261	14.29%	1,609	64.76%	22.37%	12.87%	0.00%	0.00%	NA
096103	Hancock	1,476	12.87%	190	64.74%	24.21%	10.53%	0.00%	0.00%	NA
096088	Hazelwood	17,882	14.28%	2,554	70.83%	19.07%	10.06%	0.00%	0.00%	NA
096104	Jennings	2,508	16.95%	425	55.06%	29.41%	15.53%	0.00%	0.00%	NA
096092	Kirkwood	5,281	12.71%	671	72.73%	20.72%	6.56%	0.00%	0.00%	NA
096106	Ladue	3,978	11.46%	456	72.81%	24.78%	2.41%	0.00%	0.00%	NA
096093	Lindbergh	5,874	12.68%	745	73.96%	19.46%	6.58%	0.00%	0.00%	NA
096107	Maplewood	1,134	12.08%	137	80.29%	14.60%	5.11%	0.00%	0.00%	NA
096094	Mehlville	10,679	14.61%	1,560	73.01%	20.51%	6.41%	0.00%	0.00%	NA
096109	Normandy	4,510	10.47%	472	51.69%	26.69%	21.19%	0.21%	0.00%	NA
096095	Parkway	17,274	16.41%	2,835	72.73%	20.81%	6.21%	0.00%	0.00%	NA
096090	Pattonville	5,563	16.41%	913	67.36%	23.22%	9.42%	0.00%	0.00%	NA
096110	Ritenour	6,188	13.41%	830	60.24%	24.22%	15.54%	0.00%	0.00%	NA
096111	Riverview	5,931	13.88%	823	63.18%	25.52%	11.06%	0.00%	0.00%	NA
096091	Rockwood	22,018	14.56%	3,205	77.82%	13.98%	8.21%	0.00%	0.00%	NA
096112	U. City	3,016	12.77%	385	59.48%	30.39%	9.87%	0.00%	0.00%	NA
096113	Valley Park	1,014	14.89%	151	66.89%	9.93%	22.52%	0.00%	0.00%	NA
096114	Webster	4,369	14.21%	621	75.36%	20.29%	4.19%	0.00%	0.00%	NA
096119	SSD	3,921	60.27%	2,363	4.61%	5.84%	6.64%	28.27%	46.00%	NA

Source: DESE Special Education Profile Reports 9/13

## APPENDIX D: SPECIAL EDUCATION PLACEMENT REPORT

**Table 2D: K-12 Educational Environments – Resident Host District**

DESE#	State, County or District	Student Enrollment K-12 (#)	Incidence Rate (%)	IEP Students (#)	1100- Inside Regular Class >79% (%)	1201- Inside Regular Class 40- 79% (%)	1301- Inside Regular Class 40% (%)	VSP - CBTS (%)	Courts/ Homebound (%)	SSD Schools & Purchase of Service (POS) (%)
	Missouri	888,208	12.64%	112,250	59.40%	25.79%	9.33%			
	STL County	137,209	15.52%	21,910						
096098	Affton	2,403	15.15%	364	66.08%	17.34%	10.30%	1.51%	0.00%	4.77%
096099	Bayless	1,574	13.34%	210	64.16%	24.34%	5.75%	1.33%	0.44%	3.98%
096101	Brentwood	772	13.21%	102	76.85%	15.74%	1.85%	0.00%	0.00%	5.56%
096102	Clayton	2,504	11.54%	289	81.65%	14.75%	1.80%	0.00%	0.00%	1.80%
096089	Ferg-Flor	11,261	14.29%	1,609	59.01%	22.40%	12.51%	1.02%	1.19%	3.87%
096103	Hancock	1,476	12.87%	190	59.90%	22.71%	12.08%	0.00%	1.45%	3.86%
096088	Hazelwood	17,882	14.28%	2,554	66.70%	17.89%	10.01%	0.74%	0.67%	3.98%
096104	Jennings	2,508	16.95%	425	51.63%	26.22%	14.63%	0.81%	2.03%	4.67%
096092	Kirkwood	5,281	12.71%	671	68.53%	20.28%	6.57%	1.26%	0.14%	3.22%
096106	Ladue	3,978	11.46%	456	69.77%	22.36%	3.11%	1.45%	0.21%	3.11%
096093	Lindbergh	5,874	12.68%	745	70.27%	18.15%	7.46%	1.03%	0.13%	2.96%
096107	Maplewood	1,134	12.08%	137	64.47%	20.39%	8.55%	1.32%	0.66%	4.61%
096094	Mehlville	10,679	14.61%	1,560	69.47%	19.66%	6.82%	0.80%	0.37%	2.89%
096109	Normandy	4,510	10.47%	472	46.69%	23.52%	19.51%	1.05%	1.57%	7.67%
096095	Parkway	17,274	16.41%	2,835	70.76%	19.18%	6.40%	0.90%	0.55%	2.20%
096090	Pattonville	5,563	16.41%	913	63.69%	21.72%	9.55%	0.73%	0.84%	3.46%
096110	Ritenour	6,188	13.41%	830	56.42%	23.38%	14.49%	1.54%	0.77%	3.40%
096111	Riverview	5,931	13.88%	823	58.96%	22.80%	11.35%	0.00%	1.70%	5.20%
096091	Rockwood	22,018	14.56%	3,205	75.03%	13.79%	8.20%	0.70%	0.27%	2.00%
096112	U. City	3,016	12.77%	385	57.11%	27.95%	10.36%	0.96%	0.96%	2.65%
096113	Valley Park	1,014	14.89%	151	65.38%	8.33%	22.44%	2.56%	0.64%	0.64%
096114	Webster	4,369	14.21%	621	73.91%	19.16%	3.38%	0.81%	0.48%	2.25%

Source: EXCEED – Resident Host District – No EC and No SNAP 12.1.12

## APPENDIX E: CASELOAD REPORT

**Table 1E: K-12 Caseload Information**

DESE #	District	Student Enrollment K-12 (#)	IEP Students (#)	SPED Teacher Average Caseload Weight	SPED Teacher Average # of Students (Case Manager)	SLP Average Caseload Weight	SLP Average # of Students (Case Manager)
096098	Affton	2,403	364	34.5	12	32.9	15
096099	Bayless	1,574	210	24.3	10	33.3	18
096101	Brentwood	772	102	18.7	9	24.0	9
096102	Clayton	2,504	289	22.7	13	27.5	14
096089	Ferg-Flor	11,261	1,609	29.4	11	30.8	15
096103	Hancock	1,476	190	30.2	11	31.0	17
096088	Hazelwood	17,882	2,554	33.5	13	40.4	21
096104	Jennings	2,508	425	32.8	10	28.3	14
096092	Kirkwood	5,281	671	28.0	11	28.5	13
096106	Ladue	3,978	456	28.8	12	29.4	11
096093	Lindbergh	5,874	745	34.8	13	30.7	15
096107	Maplewood	1,134	137	19.3	8	31.0	16
096094	Mehlville	10,679	1,560	33.4	12	29.7	13
096109	Normandy	4,510	472	28.6	10	28.2	10
096095	Parkway	17,274	2,835	35.1	14	32.9	14
096090	Pattonville	5,563	913	35.1	12	28.2	16
096110	Ritenour	6,188	830	32.3	11	40.3	18
096111	Riverview	5,931	823	27.4	10	26.9	14
096091	Rockwood	22,018	3,205	41.0	15	35.3	18
096112	U City	3,016	385	19.8	8	33.8	17
096113	Valley Park	1,014	151	35.0	10	26.0	11
096114	Webster	4,369	621	30.1	14	27.5	14

Source: Tableau Provider Information 11/26/12

## APPENDIX F: SSD AREA COORDINATOR REPORT

Table 1F: Area Coordinator Numbers (FTE) – October 2012

District	Coordinator	Bldgs	Students	Teachers	SLP	RS	Total teaching staff	Staff to supervise/ AC	Paras	ABA Para (AC)	ABA Para (DEPT)	Total ALL PARA	Stud/ Para
Aftton	Karr	4	358	20.50	7.00	6.50	34.00		16.00		8.00	24.00	14.92
<b>Dis. Total:</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>20.50</b>	<b>7.00</b>	<b>6.50</b>	<b>34.00</b>	<b>34.00</b>	<b>16.00</b>		<b>8.00</b>	<b>24.00</b>	<b>14.92</b>
Bayless	Cassulo	4	206	13.00	4.00	5.00	22.00		9.50		6.00	15.50	13.29
<b>Dis. Total:</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>13.00</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>22.00</b>	<b>22.00</b>	<b>9.50</b>		<b>6.00</b>	<b>15.50</b>	<b>13.29</b>
Brentwood	Selover+	5	109	8.50	2.00	2.00	12.50		7.00		1.00	8.00	13.63
<b>Dis. Total:</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>8.50</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>12.50</b>	<b>12.50</b>	<b>7.00</b>		<b>1.00</b>	<b>8.00</b>	<b>13.63</b>
Clayton	Brake	5	291	15.37	6.00	3.00	24.37		16.00		6.00	22.00	13.23
<b>Dis. Total:</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>15.37</b>	<b>6.00</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>24.37</b>	<b>24.37</b>	<b>16.00</b>		<b>6.00</b>	<b>22.00</b>	<b>13.23</b>
Ferg-Flor	Pullen	3	288	17.00	4.00	3.00	24.00		13.00			13.00	22.15
Ferg-Flor	Winfield	3	366	21.00	6.00	4.00	31.00		21.00			21.00	17.43
Ferg-Flor	Holliday	5	318	18.00	7.00	5.00	30.00		19.00			19.00	16.74
Ferg-Flor	Brooke	3	202	14.00	4.00	8.00	26.00		20.00	21.00		41.00	4.93
Ferg-Flor	Clinton-Jones	4	247	15.00	4.00	3.50	22.50		15.00	1.00		16.00	15.44
Ferg-Flor	Williams	6	178	14.00	4.00	3.00	21.00		11.50			11.50	15.48
<b>Dis. Total:</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>1599</b>	<b>99.00</b>	<b>29.00</b>	<b>26.50</b>	<b>154.50</b>	<b>25.75</b>	<b>99.50</b>	<b>22.00</b>		<b>121.5</b>	<b>13.16</b>
Hancock	McGinty*	3	187	13.00	3.00	4.00	20.00		13.00		3.00	16.00	11.69
<b>Dis. Total:</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>13.00</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>20.00</b>	<b>20.00</b>	<b>13.00</b>		<b>3.00</b>	<b>16.00</b>	<b>11.69</b>
Hazelwood	Leonard	5	353	18.00	5.00	2.00	25.00		16.00		2.00	18.00	19.61
Hazelwood	Saddler	1	302	18.00	2.00	0.00	20.00		8.00			8.00	37.75
Hazelwood	Brown	1	247	15.00	1.00	0.00	16.00		5.00			5.00	49.40
Hazelwood	French	4	243	16.00	5.00	3.00	24.00		11.00		5.00	16.00	15.19
Hazelwood	Jones	4	299	18.00	4.00	5.00	27.00		11.00		1.00	12.00	24.92
Hazelwood	Ellis	4	239	14.00	4.00	6.00	24.00		10.00		1.00	11.00	21.73
Hazelwood	Bundren	4	296	18.00	4.00	6.00	28.00		15.00		9.00	24.00	12.33
Hazelwood	Moellering	1	328	19.00	2.00	1.00	22.00		9.00			9.00	36.44
Hazelwood	Hughes	5	290	18.00	5.00	8.00	31.00		14.00		2.00	16.00	18.13
<b>Dis. Total:</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>2597</b>	<b>154.00</b>	<b>32.00</b>	<b>31.00</b>	<b>217.00</b>	<b>24.11</b>	<b>99.00</b>		<b>20.00</b>	<b>119.0</b>	<b>21.82</b>
Jennings	Jenkins	2	205	21.00	2.00	3.00	26.00		13.00		1.00	14.00	14.64
Jennings	Player	6	225	14.00	6.00	2.00	22.00		18.00		3.00	21.00	10.71
<b>Dis. Total:</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>430</b>	<b>35.00</b>	<b>8.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>48.00</b>	<b>24.00</b>	<b>31.00</b>		<b>4.00</b>	<b>35.00</b>	<b>12.29</b>
Kirkwood	Schroeder	3	426	30.00	5.00	3.00	38.00		18.00			18.00	23.67
Kirkwood	Lent	5	248	15.00	8.50	8.30	31.80		19.00	6.00		25.00	9.92
<b>Dis. Total:</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>674</b>	<b>45.00</b>	<b>13.50</b>	<b>11.30</b>	<b>69.80</b>	<b>34.90</b>	<b>37.00</b>	<b>6.00</b>		<b>43.00</b>	<b>15.67</b>
Ladue	Rehme	3	267	15.37	5.00	1.00	21.37		15.00		4.00	19.00	14.05
Ladue	Bohannon	3	191	11.00	4.00	7.00	22.00		9.00		1.00	10.00	19.10
<b>Dis. Total:</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>458</b>	<b>26.37</b>	<b>9.00</b>	<b>8.00</b>	<b>43.37</b>	<b>21.69</b>	<b>24.00</b>		<b>5.00</b>	<b>29.00</b>	<b>15.79</b>
Lindbergh	Ringhofer	5	331	13.00	9.00	9.00	31.00		21.00		12.00	33.00	10.03
Lindbergh	Turner	3	409	25.50	6.00	1.00	32.50		17.00			17.00	24.06
<b>Dis. Total:</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>740</b>	<b>38.50</b>	<b>15.00</b>	<b>10.00</b>	<b>63.50</b>	<b>31.75</b>	<b>38.00</b>		<b>12.00</b>	<b>50.00</b>	<b>14.80</b>
Maplewood	Lyles+	4	139	11.00	3.00	2.50	16.50		9.00		1.00	10.00	13.90
<b>Dis. Total:</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>11.00</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>2.50</b>	<b>16.50</b>	<b>16.50</b>	<b>9.00</b>		<b>1.00</b>	<b>10.00</b>	<b>13.90</b>

Mehlville	Wilson	3	526	38.00	6.00	4.00	48.00		14.00			14.00	37.57
Mehlville	Gleason	5	368	16.00	11.00	15.00	42.00		23.00	5.00		28.00	13.14
Mehlville	LaTempt	5	332	14.00	10.00	3.00	27.00		14.00	5.00		19.00	17.47
Mehlville	Meeks	4	336	22.00	6.00	2.00	30.00		19.00			19.00	17.68
<b>Dis. Total:</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>1562</b>	<b>90.00</b>	<b>33.00</b>	<b>24.00</b>	<b>147.00</b>	<b>36.75</b>	<b>70.00</b>	<b>10.00</b>		<b>80.00</b>	<b>19.53</b>
Normandy	Thomas*	2	172	15.00	2.00	2.00	19.00		13.00			13.00	13.23
Normandy	Hall	1	121	13.00	1.00	3.00	17.00		10.00			10.00	12.10
Normandy	Yust-	5	232	16.00	6.00	4.00	26.00		23.00		5.00	28.00	8.29
<b>Dis. Total:</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>525</b>	<b>44.00</b>	<b>9.00</b>	<b>9.00</b>	<b>62.00</b>	<b>20.67</b>	<b>46.00</b>		<b>5.00</b>	<b>51.00</b>	<b>10.29</b>
Parkway	Chamberlain	2	357	23.00	6.50	2.00	31.50		29.00		4.00	33.00	10.82
Parkway	Wildhaber	1	237	15.00	2.00	0.00	17.00		12.00			12.00	19.75
Parkway	Campbell S	1	277	14.00	1.00	1.00	16.00		13.00		2.00	15.00	18.47
Parkway	Kanterman	5	340	15.00	7.00	13.80	35.80		16.00		11.00	27.00	12.59
Parkway	Wulff	4	272	13.00	8.00	9.00	30.00		30.50		8.00	38.50	7.06
Parkway	Fortune	1	296	17.00	2.00	1.00	20.00		12.00			12.00	24.67
Parkway	Matoushek	4	270	17.00	6.00	7.00	30.00		25.00		23.00	48.00	5.63
Parkway	Pellegrini	4	514	30.00	6.00	3.00	39.00		37.00		20.00	57.00	9.02
Parkway	Campbell K	5	273	10.00	7.00	6.00	23.00		16.00			16.00	17.06
<b>Dis. Total:</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>2836</b>	<b>154.00</b>	<b>45.50</b>	<b>42.80</b>	<b>242.30</b>	<b>26.92</b>	<b>190.5</b>		<b>68.00</b>	<b>258.5</b>	<b>10.97</b>
Pattonville	Forsythe*	1	289	18.00	1.00	1.00	20.00		7.00			7.00	41.29
Pattonville	Casner	6	363	18.00	9.00	4.00	31.00		19.00		5.00	24.00	15.13
Pattonville	Bemke	3	256	19.00	4.00	6.00	29.00		13.00			13.00	19.69
<b>Dis. Total:</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>908</b>	<b>55.00</b>	<b>14.00</b>	<b>11.00</b>	<b>80.00</b>	<b>26.67</b>	<b>39.00</b>		<b>5.00</b>	<b>44.00</b>	<b>20.64</b>
Ritenour	Hofeditz	4	281	17.00	5.00	9.00	31.00		13.00		1.00	14.00	20.07
Ritenour	Whitmore	4	302	19.00	5.00	3.00	27.00		16.00		9.00	25.00	12.08
Ritenour	Quinlivan*	1	284	21.00	2.00	2.00	25.00		9.00			9.00	31.56
<b>Dis. Total:</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>867</b>	<b>57.00</b>	<b>12.00</b>	<b>14.00</b>	<b>83.00</b>	<b>27.67</b>	<b>38.00</b>		<b>10.00</b>	<b>48.00</b>	<b>18.06</b>
Riverview	Kendrick	3	306	21.00	3.00	4.00	28.00		10.00			10.00	30.60
Riverview	Wakefield	5	225	15.00	7.00	5.00	27.00		12.00		4.00	16.00	14.06
Riverview	Wheat	4	281	26.00	4.00	3.60	33.60		16.00			16.00	17.56
<b>Dis. Total:</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>812</b>	<b>62.00</b>	<b>14.00</b>	<b>12.60</b>	<b>88.60</b>	<b>29.53</b>	<b>38.00</b>		<b>4.00</b>	<b>42.00</b>	<b>19.33</b>
Rockwood	Lockhart	4	340	17.00	8.00	7.60	32.60		23.50		4.00	27.50	12.36
Rockwood	Powers	3	363	24.00	5.00	2.00	31.00		21.50		2.00	23.50	15.45
Rockwood	Blumenfeld	2	525	29.00	3.00	1.00	33.00		19.00		1.00	20.00	26.25
Rockwood	Carter	2	502	30.00	2.00	0.00	32.00		21.00			21.00	23.90
Rockwood	Rayfield	5	320	10.00	8.00	9.00	27.00		14.00		3.00	17.00	18.82
Rockwood	Nelson	5	487	20.00	8.50	8.80	37.30		21.00		8.00	29.00	16.79
Rockwood	Harris	3	324	15.00	7.00	4.00	26.00		15.00		8.00	23.00	14.09
Rockwood	Crayton	5	372	12.00	8.00	7.00	27.00		22.50		2.00	24.50	15.18
<b>Dis. Total:</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>3233</b>	<b>157.00</b>	<b>49.50</b>	<b>39.40</b>	<b>245.90</b>	<b>30.74</b>	<b>157.5</b>		<b>28.00</b>	<b>185.5</b>	<b>17.43</b>
U. City	Vasser	4	168	13.00	4.00	5.60	22.60		16.00		5.00	21.00	8.00
U. City	Berry	2	213	21.00	2.00	2.00	25.00		20.00			20.00	10.65
<b>Dis. Total:</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>381</b>	<b>34.00</b>	<b>6.00</b>	<b>7.60</b>	<b>47.60</b>	<b>23.80</b>	<b>36.00</b>		<b>5.00</b>	<b>41.00</b>	<b>9.29</b>
Webster	Watson	2	318	21.00	3.00	5.00	29.00		11.00	1.00		12.00	26.50
Webster	Tedoni	7	294	13.00	8.00	4.10	29.00		22.00	6.00		28.00	10.50
<b>Dis. Total:</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>612</b>	<b>34.00</b>	<b>11.00</b>	<b>9.10</b>	<b>58.00</b>	<b>29.00</b>	<b>33.00</b>	<b>7.00</b>		<b>40.00</b>	<b>15.30</b>
Valley Park	Bailey*	3	145	12.00	3.00	2.00	17.00		9.00	3.00		12.00	12.08
<b>Dis. Total:</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>12.00</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>17.00</b>	<b>17.00</b>	<b>9.00</b>	<b>3.00</b>		<b>12.00</b>	<b>12.08</b>
<b>Totals w/o CBT</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>19669</b>	<b>1178.24</b>	<b>328.5</b>	<b>286.3</b>	<b>1796.94</b>	<b>26.82</b>	<b>1056</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>1295</b>	<b>15.19</b>

Student Data is from 11.7.12

Staff Data is from 10.16.12

Nursing Staff is not included

\*Vocational Skills Program information not included/separate document

+Countywide ESY Program Coordinator

## APPENDIX F: SSD AREA COORDINATOR REPORT

Table 2F: Area Coordinator Numbers (FTE), Community-Based Transition – October 2012

District	Coordinator	Bldgs	Students	Teachers	SLP	RS	Total teach staff	Staff to supervise/ AC	Paras	ABA Para (AC)	ABA Para (DEPT)	Total ALL PARA	Stud/Para
CBT	Bailey	5	32	5.00	0.00	0.00	5.00		3.00			3.00	10.67
CBT	McGinty	4	25	4.00	0.00	0.00	4.00		7.00			7.00	3.57
CBT	Quinlivan	4	32	5.00	0.00	0.00	5.00		5.00			5.00	6.40
CBT	Forsythe	5	33	6.00	0.00	0.00			6.00			6.00	5.50
CBT	Thomas	9	58	9.00	1.00	1.00	11.00		9.00			9.00	6.44
<b>Total:</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>29.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>25.00</b>	<b>4.17</b>	<b>30.00</b>			<b>30.00</b>	<b>6.00</b>
Valley Park	Bailey	3	145	12.00	3.00	2.00	17.00		9.00	3.00		12.00	12.08
CBT	Bailey	5	32	5.00	0.00	0.00	5.00		3.00			3.00	10.67
<b>Total:</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>17.00</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>22.00</b>	<b>22.00</b>	<b>12.00</b>	<b>3.00</b>		<b>15.00</b>	<b>11.80</b>
Hancock	McGinty	3	187	13.00	3.00	4.00	20.00		13.00		3.00	16.00	11.69
CBT	McGinty	4	25	4.00	0.00	0.00	4.00		7.00			7.00	3.57
<b>Total:</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>17.00</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>24.00</b>	<b>24.00</b>	<b>20.00</b>		<b>3.00</b>	<b>23.00</b>	<b>9.22</b>
Ritenour	Quinlivan	1	284	21.00	2.00	0.00	23.00		9.00			9.00	31.56
CBT	Quinlivan	4	32	5.00	0.00	0.00	5.00		5.00			5.00	6.40
<b>Total:</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>26.00</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>28.00</b>	<b>28.00</b>	<b>14.00</b>			<b>14.00</b>	<b>22.57</b>
Pattonville	Forsythe	1	289	18.00	1.00	1.00	20.00		7.00			7.00	41.29
CBT	Forsythe	5	33	6.00	0.00	0.00	6.00		6.00			6.00	5.50
<b>Total:</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>322</b>	<b>24.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>26.00</b>	<b>26.00</b>	<b>13.00</b>			<b>13.00</b>	<b>24.77</b>
Normandy	Thomas	2	172	15.00	2.00	2.00	19.00		13.00			13.00	13.23
CBT	Forsythe	3	58	9.00	1.00	1.00	11.00		9.00			9.00	6.44
<b>Total:</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>24.00</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>30.00</b>	<b>30.00</b>	<b>22.00</b>			<b>22.00</b>	<b>10.45</b>

## APPENDIX F: SSD AREA COORDINATOR REPORT

Table 3F: Area Coordinator Numbers (FTE), Deaf/Hard-of-Hearing, Orthopedically Impaired and Visually Impaired – October 2012

District	Coordinator	Bldgs	Students	Teachers	SLP	RS	Total teaching staff	Staff to supervise /AC	Paras	ABA Para (AC)	ABA Para (DEPT)	Total ALL PARA	Stud/Para
Deaf/Hard-of-Hearing	Jensen			44.50	5.00	9.60	59.10		92.00			92.00	
Deaf/Hard-of-Hearing	Biedenstein												
Deaf/Hard-of-Hearing	Fanning												
	<b>3</b>			<b>44.50</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>9.60</b>	<b>59.10</b>	<b>19.70</b>	<b>92.00</b>			<b>92.00</b>	
Orth. Impaired/ Vis. Impaired	Davidson			22.50			22.50		11.00			11.00	
	<b>1</b>			<b>22.50</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>22.50</b>	<b>22.50</b>	<b>195.0</b>			<b>195.00</b>	

## APPENDIX G: SPECIALIZED PROGRAMS - LITERACY

**Table 1G: Literacy Programs and the Number of Staff trained FY12**

Literacy Program	Number of Teachers Trained	Districts
SIM Paragraph Writing	60	Hazelwood - 10 Pattonville - 1 N/A - 2 Lindbergh - 1 University City - 27 Rockwood - 9 Normandy - 3 Mehlville - 7
Step Up to Writing	70	Affton - 1 Brentwood - 1 Clayton - 2 Hancock Place - 1 Lindbergh - 16 Ladue - 1 Kirkwood - 2 Mehlville - 22 Other - 2 Hazelwood - 1 Normandy - 2 Pattonville - 2 Ritenour - 4 Riverview Gardens - 1 Rockwood - 8 SSD - 3 Webster Groves - 1
Read to Achieve	5	Pattonville - 4 Hazelwood - 1
Corrective Reading Decoding	31	Bayless - 2 Brentwood - 1 Jennings - 3 Normandy - 7 Parkway - 1 Ritenour - 4 Riverview Gardens - 4 Rockwood - 3 SSD - 6
Wilson Reading	11	Clayton - 1 Lindbergh - 2 Ritenour - 3 SSD - 1 University City - 2 Webster Groves - 2



ELSB	50	Affton-1 Ferguson-Florissant - 2 Hazelwood - 3 Jennings - 2 University City - 5 SSD - 6 Lindbergh - 1 Maplewood Richmond Heights - 3 Mehlville - 3 N/A - 2 Normandy - 4 Parkway - 3 Pattonville - 3 Ritenour - 2 Riverview Gardens - 4 Rockwood - 4 Valley Park - 1 Webster Groves - 1
SIM Fundamentals in Sentence Writing	46	Hazelwood - 7 Ladue - 1 Mehlville - 4 Parkway - 17 University City - 1 Webster Groves - 1 SSD - 3 Pattonville - 1 Ritenour - 2 Rockwood - 9
Language	42	Ferguson-Florissant - 5 Hazelwood - 6 Mehlville - 1 Other - 2 Rockwood - 9 Pattonville - 1 Parkway - 18
SIM Proficiency in Sentence Writing	34	Ferguson-Florissant - 4 Hazelwood - 3 Jennings - 2 Ladue - 1 N/A - 1 Mehlville - 4 Lindbergh - 1 Normandy - 4 Parkway - 11 Rockwood - 2 Webster Groves - 1
Phonics for Reading	6	Hazelwood - 6

Corrective Reading- Comprehension	27	Hazelwood - 1 Jennings - 4 Ladue - 1 N/A - 1 Webster Groves - 5 Normandy - 3 Parkway - 5 Pattonville - 2 Rockwood - 2 Ritenour - 3
Reading Mastery Signature	6	Normandy - 5 Pattonville - 1
SIM Visualizing Strategy	9	Parkway - 9
REWARDS	15	Brentwood - 1 Hazelwood - 1 Lindbergh - 1 Mehlville - 1 Ritenour - 11
SIPPS	35	Affton - 2 Ferguson-Florissant - 6 Lindbergh - 4 Pattonville - 23
SIM Self-Questioning	14	Parkway - 14
SIM Fundamentals in Theme Writing	4	Mehlville - 1 Parkway - 3
REWARDS Writing	4	Brentwood - 1 Hazelwood - 1 Jennings - 2
SIM Fundamentals of Paraphrasing and Summarizing	22	Ladue - 2 Mehlville - 1 Parkway - 10 Rockwood - 8 University City - 1
SIM Inference Strategy	20	Hazelwood - 1 Ladue - 2 Mehlville - 1 Parkway - 11 Rockwood - 4 Ritenour - 1

Language for Learning	8	Bayless - 2 Brentwood - 1 Hazelwood - 2 Rockwood - 1 SSD - 1 Webster Groves - 1
<b>Total Teachers Trained</b>	<b>519</b>	

## APPENDIX G: SPECIALIZED PROGRAMS – LITERACY

**Table 2G: Literacy Programs and the Number of Staff trained FY13**

Literacy Program	Number of Teachers Trained	Districts
SIM Paragraph Writing	18	Afton - 1 Ferguson-Florissant - 1 Hazelwood - 2 Jennings - 1 Web Groves - 4 SSD - 1 Riverview Gardens - 1 Ladue - 1 Other - 1 Parkway - 5
Step Up to Writing	40	Afton - 4 Bayless - 2 Ferguson-Florissant - 1 Jennings - 2 Webster Groves - 4 University City - 1 SSD - 4 Rockwood - 5 Ritenour - 4 Pattonville - 3 Parkway - 1 Other - 1 Mehlville - 1 Lindbergh - 2 Ladue - 1 Kirkwood - 4
Read to Achieve	5	Hazelwood - 1 Pattonville - 4
Corrective Reading Decoding	24	Afton - 1 Ferguson-Florissant - 3 Jennings - 4 Ladue - 1 Ritenour - 1 Normandy - 1 N/A - 2 Parkway - 4 Riverview Gardens - 1 Rockwood - 6
Wilson Reading	11	Clayton - 1 Lindbergh - 2 Pattonville - 6 University City - 1 Webster Groves - 1

ELSB	35	Ferguson-Florissant - 5 Hazelwood - 3 Jennings - 2 Kirkwood - 1 Lindbergh - 1 Mehlville - 2 Ladue - 1 N/A - 1 Normandy - 3 Parkway - 3 Pattonville - 2 Ritenour - 4 Riverview Gardens - 1 Rockwood - 4 SSD - 1 Webster Groves - 1
SIM Fundamentals in Sentence Writing	32	Affton - 2 Ferguson-Florissant - 1 Hazelwood - 1 Jennings - 1 Pattonville - 1 Parkway - 9 Ritenour - 4 Riverview Gardens - 2 Rockwood - 9 SSD - 2
Language	43	Ferguson-Florissant - 2 Hazelwood - 10 N/A - 1 Parkway - 20 SSD - 1 Ritenour - 2 Rockwood - 5 Webster Groves - 2
SIM Proficiency in Sentence Writing	28	Affton - 2 Ferguson-Florissant - 1 Hazelwood - 1 Mehlville - 1 Parkway - 13 Ritenour - 1 Riverview Gardens - 2 Rockwood - 3 SSD - 1 Webster Groves - 3
Phonics for Reading	12	Hazelwood - 2 Lindbergh - 7 Ritenour - 1 University City - 1 Webster Groves - 1

Corrective Reading- Comprehension	8	Jennings - 4 Brentwood - 1 Hazelwood - 1 Parkway - 1 Rockwood - 1
Reading Mastery Signature	4	Ferguson-Florissant - 1 Jennings - 1 Normandy - 2
SIM Visualizing Strategy	5	Afton - 2 Parkway - 3
REWARDS	5	Hazelwood - 2 Pattonville - 1 Ritenour - 2
SIPPS	27	Afton - 1 Bayless - 1 Ferguson-Florissant - 8 Lindbergh - 1 Other - 2 Parkway - 2 Pattonville - 5 Riverview Gardens - 1 Rockwood - 4 Webster Groves - 4
SIM Self-Questioning	9	Afton - 1 Parkway - 4 Rockwood - 2 SSD - 2
SIM Fundamentals in Theme Writing	7	Bayless - 1 Brentwood - 1 N/A - 1 Parkway - 3 Rockwood - 1
REWARDS Writing	3	Clayton - 1 Ritenour - 1 Riverview Gardens - 1
SIM Fundamentals of Paraphrasing and Summarizing	24	Ferguson-Florissant - 1 Hazelwood - 2 Ladue - 1 N/A - 1 Rockwood - 3 Pattonville - 1 Parkway - 15
SIM Inference Strategy	23	Ferguson-Florissant - 1 Hazelwood - 3 Ladue - 1 N/A - 1 Parkway - 13 Pattonville - 1 Rockwood - 3

Language for Learning	7	Hazelwood - 2 Mehlville - 2 Parkway - 1 Riverview Gardens - 1 Rockwood - 1
Unique Learning System (ULS)	82	Ferguson-Florissant - 18 Hazelwood - 3 Mehlville - 1 N/A - 1 Parkway - 19 Normandy - 1 Other - 1 Riverview Gardens - 2 Rockwood - 14 SSD - 17 University City - 4 Webster Groves - 1
<b>Total Teachers Trained</b>	<b>452</b>	

## APPENDIX G: SPECIALIZED PROGRAMS – LITERACY

**Table 3G: Literacy Programs and the Number of Staff trained FY14**

Literacy Program	Number of Teachers Trained	Districts
SIM Paragraph Writing	30	Ferguson-Florissant - 1 Hazelwood - 3 Lindbergh - 5 Parkway - 7 Ritenour - 1 Rockwood - 11 Webster Groves - 2
Step Up to Writing	26	Afton - 1 Bayless - 3 Brentwood - 1 Ferguson-Florissant - 1 Hazelwood - 2 Jennings - 1 Ladue - 1 Parkway - 4 Pattonville - 3 Rockwood - 8 SSD - 1
Read to Achieve	6	Rockwood - 4 Lindbergh - 1 Ferguson-Florissant - 1
Corrective Reading Decoding	27	Brentwood - 1 Ferguson-Florissant - 2 Hazelwood - 2 Jennings - 3 Kirkwood - 1 Ladue - 4 Lindbergh - 4 Mehlville - 1 Parkway - 4 Ritenour - 2 Riverview Gardens - 2 University City - 1
Wilson Reading	12	Ferguson-Florissant - 1 Pattonville - 2 Hazelwood - 1 Riverview Gardens - 4 Webster Groves - 2 SSD - 2



ELSB	22	Bayless - 1 Ferguson-Florissant - 2 Hazelwood - 2 Jennings - 2 Ladue - 1 Normandy - 1 Parkway - 2 Ritenour - 3 Rockwood - 4 SSD - 1 Webster Groves - 2
SIM Fundamentals in Sentence Writing	34	Ferguson-Florissant - 1 Hazelwood - 4 Lindbergh - 2 Parkway - 5 U City - 1 Rockwood - 8 Ritenour - 2 Pattonville - 11
Language	49	Affton - 1 Bayless - 1 Clayton - 3 Ferguson-Florissant - 2 Webster Groves - 3 Rockwood - 4 Riverview Gardens - 1 Ritenour - 2 Parkway - 12 Hazelwood - 20
SIM Proficiency in Sentence Writing	31	Ferguson-Florissant - 2 Hazelwood - 2 Lindbergh - 3 Mehlville - 1 Rockwood - 1 Webster Groves - 1 Ritenour - 1 Pattonville - 15 Parkway - 5
Phonics for Reading	8	Hazelwood - 2 Lindbergh - 1 Parkway - 2 Ritenour - 2 University City - 1
Corrective Reading-Comprehension	4	Ladue - 2 Parkway - 2
Reading Mastery Signature	10	Clayton - 3 Jennings - 4 Normandy - 3
SIM Visualizing Strategy	2	Parkway - 1 Rockwood - 1

REWARDS	13	Ferguson-Florissant - 1 Parkway - 2 Ritenour - 6 Riverview Gardens - 2 Rockwood - 2
SIPPS	50	Afton - 1 Bayless - 1 Ferguson-Florissant - 1 Hazelwood - 9 Jennings - 1 Kirkwood - 2 Lindbergh - 3 Mehlville - 1 Parkway - 8 Pattonville - 7 Riverview Gardens - 3 Rockwood - 10 SSD - 1 University City - 1 Webster Groves -1
SIM Self-Questioning	21	Jennings - 2 Other - 1 Parkway - 12 Pattonville - 1 Rockwood - 3 Webster Groves -1 Riverview Gardens - 1
SIM Fundamentals in Theme Writing	6	Afton - 1 Mehlville - 1 Parkway - 2 Webster Groves - 2
REWARDS Plus	3	Hazelwood - 1 Parkway - 2
SIM Fundamentals of Paraphrasing and Summarizing	25	Hazelwood - 3 Afton - 1 Ferguson-Florissant - 3 Lindbergh - 6 Ritenour - 2 Parkway - 2 Other - 1 Riverview Gardens - 1 Rockwood - 4 Webster Groves - 3

SIM Inference Strategy	30	Affton - 1 Ferguson-Florissant - 2 Hazelwood - 3 Lindbergh - 6 Other - 2 Parkway - 5 Pattonville - 1 Ritenour - 2 Rockwood - 4 SSD - 1 Webster Groves - 3
Language for Learning	6	Hazelwood - 1 Jennings - 2 Pattonville - 2 Webster Groves - 1
Unique Learning System (ULS)	75	Affton - 2 Clayton - 1 Ferguson-Florissant - 3 Hazelwood - 11 Jennings - 1 Kirkwood - 1 Ladue - 2 Lindbergh - 2 Mehlville - 7 Normandy - 2 Other - 1 Parkway - 14 Pattonville - 5 Ritenour - 3 Riverview Gardens - 3 Rockwood - 11 SSD - 5 University City - 1
<b>Total Teachers Trained</b>	<b>490</b>	

## APPENDIX G(2): SPECIALIZED PROGRAMS – VOCATIONAL SKILLS PROGRAM

**Table 1G(2): Students Attending Vocational Skills Program by District and Disability**

School District	Primary Disability (Number of Students Per District)										District Total
	AU	DF	ED	HO	ID	LD	MU	OHI	OI	TBI	
Aftton	2							1	1		4
Bayless	1				1						2
Clayton	2				1						3
Ferg-Flor					7	1					8
Hazelwood	4		2	1	9	2					18
Jennings	1				2						3
Kirkwood								1			1
Ladue	1				1			1			3
Lindbergh	1		1		1		1	1		1	6
Maplewood					1			1			2
Mehlville	1				2			1		1	5
Normandy					1						1
Parkway	4				6		2	1			13
Pattonville					1						1
Ritenour					1		1				2
Riverview					1						1
Rockwood	6	1	2		5		1	1			16
University City	1							1			2
Valley Park						1					1
Webster Groves	2							1			
<b>Total by Disability</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	

## APPENDIX G(3): SPECIALIZED PROGRAMS – COMMUNITY-BASED VOCATIONAL INSTRUCTION (CBVI)

**Table 1G(3): Community-Based Vocational Instruction Students by District**

<b>School District</b>	<b>Number of CBVI Students</b>
Aftton	8
Bayless	6
Brentwood	5
Clayton	2
Ferguson-Florissant	58
Hancock Place	9
Hazelwood	76
Jennings	9
Kirkwood	9
Ladue	4
Lindbergh	7
Maplewood Richmond Heights	2
Mehlville	65
Normandy	10
Parkway	78
Pattonville	13
Ritenour	16
Riverview	12
Rockwood	81
University City	14
Valley Park	4
Webster Groves	12

## APPENDIX G(4): SPECIALIZED PROGRAMS – APPLIED BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS

**Table 1G(4): School-Age Students Receiving ABA Services by District**

<b>School District</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>
Affton	10
Bayless	10
Brentwood	3
Clayton	11
Ferguson-Florissant	34
Hancock Place	3
Hazelwood	49
Jennings	10
Kirkwood	36
Ladue	9
Lindbergh	19
Maplewood Richmond Heights	4
Mehlville	34
Normandy	9
Parkway	99
Pattonville	7
Ritenour	18
Riverview Gardens	8
Rockwood	54
Special School District	126
University City	20
Valley Park	3
Webster Groves	20
<b>Total</b>	<b>596</b>

## APPENDIX H: MAP – COMMUNICATION ARTS

### FINDINGS

Guiding Questions for Sub-Committee on *Special Education Outcomes* –

What are the MAP and EOC data for students served by the SSD as a whole and separated by district and school building? Are there differences within this data associated with race, gender, disability and poverty?

**Question 1. MAP Communication Arts (CA)** – What are the **MAP** and EOC data for students served by the SSD as a whole and separated by district? Are there differences within this data associated with race, gender, disability and poverty?

#### 2013 MAP Communication Arts

##### Participation Rates and Achievement Level Percentage Students with Disabilities:

###### St. Louis County, Served by SSD as a Whole: Participation and Achievement Level

St. Louis County reports nearly 100% participation rate in MAP administration for students with disabilities. 69% of those students scored at Basic or below with 31% scoring at the Proficient or Advanced level. The MAP Performance Index (MPI) for students receiving special education services in St. Louis County was 295.

###### **State of Missouri as a Whole: Participation and Achievement Level**

Missouri reports nearly 100% participation rate in MAP administration for students with disabilities. 75% of those students scored at Basic or below with 25% scoring at the Proficient or Advanced level. The Part B Target for Proficient and Advanced is 57.9%. The MAP Performance Index (MPI) for students receiving special education services in Missouri was 278.

**Table 1H: St. Louis County/State of Missouri Special Education MAP Communication Arts Percent**

	Participation	Basic & Below	Prof & Adv	Part B Target	MPI
St. Louis County	99.7	68.7	31.3		294.5
Missouri	99.6	74.8	25.2	57.9	278.0

##### Disaggregated by District: Participation Rate and Achievement Level by District:

- Eight (8) districts reported a lower participation rate than St. Louis County: Jennings, Affton, Clayton, Ferguson-Florissant, Lindbergh, Ladue, Ritenour and Riverview Gardens.
- Fourteen (14) districts equal to or higher than the county: Parkway, Kirkwood, Pattonville, Hazelwood, Mehlville, Rockwood, Webster, Valley Park, University City, Normandy, Maplewood, Hancock Place, Brentwood and Bayless.
- Seven (7) districts report a lower participation rate than the state: Affton, Clayton, Ferguson-Florissant, Lindbergh, Ladue, Ritenour and Riverview Gardens.

- Fifteen (15) districts report a higher participation rate than the state: Bayless, Brentwood, Hancock Place, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Normandy, University City, Valley Park, Webster, Rockwood, Mehlville, Hazelwood, Pattonville, Kirkwood, Parkway and Jennings.

#### **Basic & Below Basic:**

- Thirteen (13) districts had fewer students score at the Basic and Below Basic level of proficiency on the MAP than St. Louis County: Ladue, Lindbergh, Clayton, Parkway, Kirkwood, Affton, Brentwood, Valley Park, Rockwood, Webster, Hancock Place, Mehlville and Pattonville.
- Nine (9) districts had more students score at the Basic and Below Basic level of proficiency than the county: Riverview Gardens, Normandy, Bayless, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Ferguson-Florissant, Hazelwood, University City, Ritenour and Jennings.
- Fifteen (15) districts had fewer students score at the Basic and Below Basic levels of proficiency on the MAP than the state of Missouri: Ladue, Lindbergh, Clayton, Parkway, Kirkwood, Affton, Brentwood, Valley Park, Rockwood, Webster, Hancock Place, Mehlville, Pattonville, Riverview Gardens and Normandy.
- Seven (7) districts had more students score at the Basic and Below Basic level of proficiency than the state: Bayless, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Ferguson-Florissant, Hazelwood, University City, Ritenour and Jennings.

#### **Proficient & Advanced:**

- Nine (9) districts had fewer students score at the Proficient and Advanced levels of proficiency on the MAP than St. Louis County: Bayless, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Ferguson-Florissant, Hazelwood, University City, Ritenour, Jennings, Normandy, Riverview Gardens, Ladue, Valley Park, Lindbergh, Clayton, Parkway, Kirkwood, Affton, Brentwood, Rockwood, Webster Groves, Hancock Place, Mehlville and Pattonville.
- Thirteen (13) districts had more students score at the Proficient and Advanced levels of proficiency than the county: Ladue, Valley Park, Lindbergh, Clayton, Parkway, Kirkwood, Affton, Brentwood, Rockwood, Webster Groves, Hancock Place, Mehlville and Pattonville.
- Nine (9) districts had fewer students score at the Proficient and Advanced levels of proficiency on the MAP than those in Missouri: Bayless, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Ferguson-Florissant, Hazelwood, University City, Ritenour, Jennings, Normandy and Riverview Gardens.
- Thirteen (13) districts had more students score at the Proficient and Advanced levels of proficiency than the state: Ladue, Valley Park, Lindbergh, Clayton, Parkway, Kirkwood, Affton, Brentwood, Rockwood, Webster Groves, Hancock Place, Mehlville and Pattonville.
- All districts scored lower than the Part B Target.

**Table 2H: St. Louis County Special Education by District and SSD – Participation and Achievement Level – MAP Communication Arts (Number of Districts)**

	<b>Participation</b>	<b>Below Basic / Basic</b>	<b>Proficient / Advanced</b>	<b>Part B Target</b>
<State	7	15	9	22
>State	15	7	13	0
< County	8	13	9	
> County	14	9	13	



### Disaggregated by District & SSD: Ethnicity - African American:

- Eight (8) districts representing the top 33% had between 67% and 84% of black students with disabilities score at the Below Basic/Basic proficiency level on MAP CA: Brentwood, Affton, Lindbergh, Valley Park, Hancock Place, Ladue, SSD and Pattonville.
- Eight (8) districts representing the middle 33% had between 85.0% and 91%: Parkway, Rockwood, Webster Groves, Mehlville, Kirkwood, Hazelwood, Clayton and Ferguson-Florissant.
- Seven (7) districts representing the lower 33% had 91% to 96%: University City, Jennings, Riverview Gardens, Bayless, Ritenour, Maplewood Richmond Heights and Normandy.
- Eight (8) districts representing the top 33% had between 15% and 33% of black students with disabilities score at the Proficient/Advanced levels on MAP CA: Brentwood, Affton, Lindbergh, Valley Park, Hancock Place, Ladue, Pattonville and SSD.
- Eight (8) representing the middle 33% had 9% to 14%: Clayton, Hazelwood, Kirkwood, Mehlville, Webster Groves, Parkway and University City.
- Seven (7) representing the lower 33% had 4% to 9%: Ferguson-Florissant, Jennings, Bayless, Ritenour, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Normandy and Riverview.

**Table 3H: St. Louis County Special Education by District and SSD – Ethnicity Black – MAP Communication Arts (Range and Number of Districts)**

	Below Basic / Basic		Proficient / Advanced	
Top 33%	66.6% - 84.2%	8	14.6% - 33.3%	8
Mid 33%	85.0% - 91.3%	8	9.3% - 14.1%	8
Low 33%	91.3% - 95.8%	7	4.1% - 8.7%	7

### Disaggregated by District & SSD: Ethnicity – Caucasian:

- Eight (8) districts representing the top 33% had between 30% and 56% of Caucasian students with disabilities score at the Below Basic/Basic level of proficiency on MAP CA: Valley Park, Lindbergh, Parkway, Kirkwood, Clayton, Ladue and University City.
- Eight (8) districts representing the middle 33% had between 58% and 76%: Ferguson-Florissant, Mehlville, Hancock Place, Pattonville, Affton, Brentwood and Webster Groves.
- Seven (7) districts representing the lower 33% had between 77% and 100%: Normandy, Riverview Gardens, Bayless, Ritenour, Jennings, SSD, Maplewood and Hazelwood.
- Eight (8) districts representing the top 33% had between 44% and 70% of Caucasian students with disabilities score at the Proficient/Advanced level of proficiency on MAP CA: University City, Ladue, Clayton, Kirkwood, Parkway, Valley Park, Webster Groves and Lindbergh.
- Eight (8) districts representing the middle 33% had between 24% and 43%: Brentwood, Affton, Rockwood, Pattonville, Hancock Place, Mehlville, Ferguson-Florissant and Hazelwood.
- Seven (7) districts representing the lower 33% had between 0% and 23%: Maplewood Richmond Heights, SSD, Jennings, Bayless, Ritenour, Normandy and Riverview Gardens.

**Table 4H: St. Louis County Special Education by District and SSD – Ethnicity Caucasian – MAP Communication Arts (Number of Districts)**

	<b>Below Basic / Basic</b>		<b>Proficient / Advanced</b>	
Top 33%	30.3% - 56.1%	8	43.6% - 70.0%	8
Mid 33%	57.5% - 76.2%	8	23.5% - 42.5%	8
Low 33%	77.3% - 100.0%	7	0.0% - 22.7%	7

**Disaggregated by District & SSD: Socio – Economic Status (Not Free/Reduced):**

- Eight (8) districts representing the top 33% had between 45% and 57% of students not receiving free/reduced lunch scoring at the Below Basic/Basic level or proficiency on MAP CA: Ladue, Clayton, Kirkwood, Valley Park, Parkway, Lindbergh, Affton and Brentwood.
- Eight (8) districts representing the middle 33% had between 57% and 80%: Rockwood, Pattonville, Webster Groves, Hancock Place, Mehlville, University City, Maplewood Richmond Heights and Ferguson-Florissant.
- Seven (7) districts representing the lower 33% had between 82% and 92%: Ritenour, Hazelwood, Bayless, SSD, Riverview Gardens, Jennings and Normandy.
- Eight (8) districts representing the top 33% had between 43% and 55% of students not receiving free/reduced lunch scoring at the Proficient/Advanced level of proficiency on MAP CA: Ladue, Clayton, Valley Park, Kirkwood, Parkway, Lindbergh, Affton and Brentwood.
- Eight (8) districts representing the middle 33% had between 19% and 43%: Rockwood, Pattonville, Webster Groves, Hancock Place, Mehlville, University City, Maplewood Richmond Heights and Ferguson-Florissant.
- Seven (7) districts representing the lower 33% had between 3% and 18%: Bayless, Hazelwood, Ritenour, SSD, Jennings, Normandy and Riverview Gardens.

**Table 5H: St. Louis County Special Education by District and SSD – SES Not Free-and-Reduced Lunch – MAP Communication Arts (Range)**

	<b>Below Basic / Basic</b>		<b>Proficient / Advanced</b>	
Top 33%	44.8% - 56.7% -	8	43.2% - 54.7%	8
Mid 33%	57.0% - 79.7%	8	19.3% - 42.9%	8
Low 33%	81.8% - 91.6%	7	3.3% - 18.2%	7

**Disaggregated by District & SSD: Socio – Economic Status (Free/Reduced):**

- Eight (8) districts representing the top 33% had between 66% and 80% of students receiving free/reduced lunch scoring at the Below Basic/Basic level of proficiency on MAP CA: Affton, Brentwood, Hancock Place, Lindbergh, Valley Park, Parkway, Pattonville and Ladue.
- Eight (8) districts representing the middle 33% had between 81% and 89%: SSD, Mehlville, Kirkwood, Rockwood, Webster, Maplewood, Bayless and Hazelwood.
- Seven (7) districts representing the lower 33% had between 89% and 96%: Ritenour, Ferguson-Florissant, University City, Jennings, Clayton Riverview Gardens and Normandy.

- Eight (8) districts representing the top 33% had between 19% and 34% of students receiving free/reduced lunch scoring at the Proficient/Advanced level of proficiency on Map CA: Affton, Brentwood, Hancock Place, Lindbergh, Valley Park, Parkway, Pattonville and Ladue.
- Eight (8) districts representing the middle 33% had between 11% and 19%: SSD, Mehlville, Kirkwood, Rockwood, Webster, Maplewood, Bayless and Hazelwood.
- Seven (7) districts representing the lower 33% had between 4% and 10% of students scoring in the Proficient/Advanced level: Ritenour, Ferguson-Florissant, University City, Jennings, Clayton, Riverview Gardens and Normandy.

**Table 6H: St. Louis County Special Education by District and SSD – SES Free-and-Reduced Lunch – MAP Communication Arts (Range and Number of Districts)**

	<b>Below Basic / Basic</b>		<b>Proficient / Advanced</b>	
Top 33%	66.3% - 80.3%	8	19.2% - 33.6%	8
Mid 33%	81.0% - 88.9%	8	10.8% - 19.0%	8
Low 33%	89.1% - 96.1%	7	3.9% - 10.0%	7

**Disaggregated by District and SSD: Grade Level (Elementary Grades 3, 4 and 5):**

**Proficient & Advanced:**

- Eight (8) districts representing the top 33% had between 42% and 63% of students score at the Proficient/Advanced level in Grade 3: Valley Park, Kirkwood, SSD, Hancock Place, Clayton, Ladue, Parkway and Rockwood.
- Eight (8) districts representing the middle 33% had between 23% and 41% of students score at the Proficient/Advanced level in Grade 3: Hazelwood, Ritenour, Mehlville, Pattonville, Brentwood, Webster Groves, Lindbergh and Affton.
- Seven (7) districts representing the lower 33% had between 0% and 21% of students score at the Proficient/Advanced level in Grade 3: Bayless, Riverview Gardens, Normandy, University City, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Ferguson-Florissant and Jennings.
- Eight (8) districts representing the top 33% had between 44% and 70% of students score at the Proficient/Advanced level in Grade 4: Maplewood Richmond Heights, Clayton, SSD, Parkway, Ladue, Lindbergh, Rockwood and Hancock Place.
- Eight (8) districts representing the middle 33% had between 33% and 42% of students score at the Proficient and Advanced level in Grade 4: Kirkwood, Affton, Pattonville, Webster Groves, Mehlville, Bayless, Brentwood and Valley Park.
- Seven (7) districts representing the lower 33% had between 1% and 32% of students score at the Proficient and Advanced level in Grade 4: University City, Jennings, Ferguson-Florissant, Hazelwood, Ritenour, Normandy and Riverview Gardens.
- Eight (8) districts representing the top 33% had between 40% and 61% of students score at the Proficient and Advanced level in Grade 5: SSD, Ladue, Lindbergh, Valley Park, Parkway, Rockwood, Clayton and Kirkwood.
- Eight (8) districts representing the middle 33% had between 19% and 38% of students score at the Proficient and Advanced level in Grade 5: Webster Groves, Pattonville, Affton, Mehlville, Hancock Place, Hazelwood, Brentwood and University City.

- Seven (7) districts representing the lower 33% had between 0% and 18% of students score at the Proficient/Advanced level in Grade 5: Normandy, Ferguson-Florissant, Bayless, Ritenour, Riverview Gardens, Jennings and Maplewood Richmond Heights.

**Table 7H: St. Louis County Special Education by District and SSD – Grade-Level Proficient and Advanced – MAP Communication Arts (Range and Number of Districts)**

	<b>Grade 3</b>		<b>Grade 4</b>		<b>Grade 5</b>	
Top 33%	41.8% - 62.5%	8	44.4% - 70.0%	8	40.0% - 60.5%	8
Mid 33%	23.2% - 41.2%	8	33.3% - 41.8%	8	19.4% - 38.0%	8
Low 33%	0.0% - 21.4%	7	11.4% - 32.1%	7	0.0% - 17.9%	7

**Disaggregated by District and SSD: Grade Level (Middle School Grades 6, 7 and 8):**

**Table 8H: Special School District – Percent of Students with Disabilities in Proficient and Advanced (by Grade)**

<b>EOC Subject Area / Grade</b>	<b>% Proficient &amp; Advanced</b>
Grade 6	58.7%
Grade 7	66.7%
Grade 8	58.6%
ELA 1	16.1%
ELA 2	22.2%

**Table 9H: St. Louis County – Students with Disabilities in Proficient and Advanced – MAP/MAP A for Communication Arts (by Grade)**

	<b>Grade 6 (Range and #)</b>		<b>Grade 7 (Range and #)</b>		<b>Grade 8 (Range and #)</b>	
Top	40.5-52.9%	5	40-70%	3	43.3-55.6%	6
Mid	26-35.9%	6	22.6-34.4%	8	26.7-38.9%	8
Low	0-18.9%	11	0-16.9%	11	0-14.8%	8
SSD	58.7%		66.7%		58.6%	

#### **Grade 6:**

- The range for partner districts for Grade 6 is 0 to 52.9% of students with disabilities scoring in Proficient and Advanced for MAP Communication Arts.
- Five (5) partner districts had students with disabilities scoring in the top range of Proficient and Advanced of 40.5 to 52.9%. (Affton – 42.3%; Brentwood – 50%; Clayton – 47.6%; Parkway – 40.5%; Valley Park – 52.9%.)

- Six (6) partner districts had students with disabilities scoring in the mid range of Proficient and Advanced of 26 to 35.9%: Kirkwood – 35.9%; Ladue – 31.3%; Lindbergh – 33.9%; Pattonville – 26%; Rockwood – 31.9%; and Webster Groves – 34.9%.
- Eleven (11) partner districts had students with disabilities scoring in the low range of Proficient and Advanced of 0 to 18.9%: Bayless – 10%; Ferguson Florissant – 14.7%; Hancock Place – 0; Hazelwood – 12.4%; Jennings – 17.5%; Maplewood Richmond Heights – 0; Mehlville – 18.9%; Normandy – 5.7%; Ritenour – 18.4%; Riverview Gardens – 11.3%; and University City – 9.4%.

#### **Grade 7:**

- The range for partner districts for Grade 7 is 0% to 70% of students with disabilities scoring in the Proficient and Advanced range for MAP Communication Arts.
- Three (3) partner districts had students scoring in the top range of 40% to 70%: Brentwood – 50%; Ladue – 40%; and Valley Park – 70%.
- Eight (8) partner districts had students scoring in the mid range of 22.7% to 34.4%: Clayton – 26.7%; Kirkwood – 30.2%; Lindbergh – 34.4%; Parkway – 30.3%; Pattonville – 26.8%; Rockwood – 31.3%; and Webster Groves – 22.7%.
- Eleven (11) partner districts had students scoring in the low range of 0 to 16.9%: Affton – 15.8%; Bayless – 9.1%; Ferguson Florissant – 15.1%; Hancock Place – 10.5%; Hazelwood 12.6%; Jennings – 15.6%; Maplewood Richmond Heights – 0; Normandy – 0; Ritenour – 16.9%; Riverview Gardens – 0; and University City – 8%.

#### **Grade 8:**

- The range for partner districts for Grade 8 is 0 to 55.6% of students with disabilities scoring in the Proficient and Advanced range for MAP Communication Arts.
- Six (6) partner districts had students scoring in the top range of 0 to 55.6%: Brentwood – 50%; Clayton – 52.6%; Kirkwood – 43.3%; Ladue – 47.6%; Lindbergh – 51.1%; and Valley Park – 55.6%.
- Eight (8) partner districts had students scoring in the mid range of 26.7% to 38.9%: Affton – 36.4%; Bayless – 38.9%; Hancock Place – 26.7%; Mehlville – 37.6%; Parkway – 34.5%; Pattonville – 27.7%; Rockwood – 36.3%; and Webster Groves – 30.8%.
- Eight (8) partner districts had students scoring in the low range of 0 to 14.8%: Ferguson Florissant – 11.1%; Hazelwood – 12.4%; Jennings – 8.3%; Maplewood Richmond Heights – 14.3%; Normandy – 0; Ritenour – 8.3%; Riverview Gardens – 3.3%; and University City – 0.

**Table 10H: St. Louis County Special Education by District and SSD – Grade-Level EOC – MAP Communication Arts (by Grade)**

	<b>ELA 1</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>ELA II</b>	<b>#</b>
Top 33%	46-66.7%	4	59.6-72.7%	4
Mid 33%	27.5-39.2%	7	27.3-50%	8
Low 33%	0-17.5%	10	0-17.6%	8
SSD	16.1%		22.2%	

Note: Brentwood N/A for ELA I.

**ELA 1:**

- The range for percent of students with disabilities performing at the Proficient and Advanced range among all partner districts was 0 to 66.7%.
- Four (4) partner districts had performance in the top range among all districts for students with disabilities performing at the Proficient and Advanced range between 46% and 66.7% on ELA 1: Hancock Place – 66.7%; Ladue – 52.5%; and Normandy – 50%; and Kirkwood – 46%.
- Seven (7) partner districts had performance in the mid range among all districts for students with disabilities performing at the Proficient and Advanced range between 27.5% and 39.2%: Affton – 38.1%; Lindbergh – 39.2%; Mehlville – 34.6%; Rockwood – 33.1%; Valley Park – 37.5%, and Webster Groves – 27.5%.
- Ten (10) partner districts had performance in the low range among all districts for students with disabilities performing at the Proficient and Advanced range between 0 and 17.5%: Bayless – 0; Clayton – 15%; Ferguson Florissant – 11.1%; Hazelwood – 13.5%; Jennings – 5%; Maplewood Richmond Heights – 14.3%; Pattonville – 17.5%; Ritenour – 8.3%; Riverview Gardens – 5.7%; and University City – 8.1%.

**ELA II:**

(The range for percent of students with disabilities performing at the Proficient and Advanced range among all partner districts was 0 to 72.7%.

- Four (4) partner districts had performance in the top range among all districts for students with disabilities performing at the Proficient and Advanced range between 59.6% and 72.7%: Affton – 72.7%; Ladue – 66.7%; Lindbergh – 62.5%; and Parkway – 59.6%.
- Eleven (11) partner districts had performance in the mid range among all districts for students with disabilities performing at the Proficient and Advanced range between 27.3% and 50%: Bayless – 27.3%; Brentwood – 50%; Clayton – 47.6%; Kirkwood – 43.1%; Mehlville – 39.1%; Pattonville – 44.4%; Rockwood – 47.9%; University City – 27.3%; Valley Park – 40%; and Webster Groves – 41.3%.
- Seven (7) partner districts had performance in the low range among all districts for students with disabilities performing at the Proficient and Advanced range between 0 and 17.6%: Ferguson-Florissant – 21.3%; Hazelwood – 19.3%; Maplewood Richmond Heights – 0; Normandy – 0; Ritenour – 17.6%; and Riverview Gardens – 3.8%.

## APPENDIX H(2): MAP – MATHEMATICS

### FINDINGS

Guiding Questions for Sub-Committee on *Special Education Outcomes* –

What are the MAP and EOC data for students served by the SSD as a whole and separated by district and school building? Are there differences within this data associated with race, gender, disability and poverty?

**Question 1. MAP Math** – What are the **MAP** and EOC data for students served by the SSD as a whole and separated by district? Are there differences within this data associated with race, gender, disability and poverty?

#### 2013 MAP Math

##### Participation Rates and Achievement Level Percentage:

**Participation Rates - Disaggregated by District: Participation Rate and Achievement Level by Partner District and SSD:**

**Table 1H(2): Participation Rate by Partner Districts for MAP Math**

	Number of Districts	County	State
At 100%	10		
99 – 99.9%	12	99.6%	99.5%
Below 99%	1		

- Ten (10) districts have a participation rate for MAP Math at 100% - high range: Bayless, Brentwood, Clayton, Hancock Place, Ladue, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Normandy, Pattonville, Valley Park and Webster Groves.
- Seventeen (17) districts have participation rates at or above the state average: The 10 above plus Affton, Ferguson-Florissant, Jennings, Lindbergh, Ritenour, Hazelwood, Kirkwood, Mehlville, Parkway, Rockwood, SSD and University City – mid range).
- One (1) district had a participation rate below 99% - low range: Riverview Gardens at 97.8.

**Table 2H(2): MAP Math Proficient & Advanced – Partner Districts and SSD**

Performance Area Ranges	Number of Districts	STL CO	State
Top – 40.7 – 67%	8		
Mid – 26 to 40.5 %	8	31.7%	28.2%
Low – 6.8 to 19.4%	7		

- Eight (8) partner districts and SSD had performance for students with disabilities in the top third of Proficient and Advanced with a range of 41.1% to 62.1%: Brentwood, Clayton, Kirkwood, Lindbergh, Parkway, Rockwood, Valley Park and SSD.
- Eight (8) partner districts had a performance rate for students with disabilities in the mid range for Proficient and Advanced between 26% and 40.5%: Ladue, Affton, Hancock Place, Pattonville, Webster Groves, Mehlville, Bayless and Maplewood Richmond Heights.
- Seven (7) partner districts had a performance rate for students with disabilities between 6.8% and 19.4%: Ferguson-Florissant, Hazelwood, Jennings, Normandy, Ritenour, Riverview Gardens and University City.
- The range for students in Proficient and Advanced for partner districts was 6.8% to 52% and for SSD was 67%.

**Table 3H(2): District Performance in Relation to the IDEA State Performance Plan**

Benchmark range	Number of Districts
Above Part B Target - 58.9%	1(SSD)
Above STL CO – 31.7%	13
Above State – 28.2%	14

- There are not partner districts above the state Part B target of 58.9%. SSD was above the state target. SSD had 224 students taking MAP A and 109 non – MAP A.
- Twelve (12) districts and SSD are above the average for St. Louis County: Affton, Brentwood, Clayton, Hancock, Kirkwood, Ladue, Lindbergh, Parkway, Pattonville, Rockwood, Valley Park and Webster Groves.
- Thirteen (13) districts and SSD are above the state average: Above-listed districts plus Mehlville.

**Table 4H(2): Map Math – Basic and Below Basic**

Performance range	Number of Districts	STL CO	State
Top – 32.7 to 58%	7		
Mid – 59.2 to 74%	9	68.3%	71.7%
Low – 80.6 to 91.1%	7		

- Seven (7) districts including SSD are in the range top range of performance of 32.7% to 58% of students in the Basic and Below Basic category: Clayton, Kirkwood, Lindbergh, Parkway, Rockwood, Valley Park and SSD.
- Nine (9) districts are in the mid range of 59.7 % to 73.8 % of students in the Basic and Below category: Bayless, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Mehlville, Pattonville, Webster Groves, Hancock, Affton, Ladue and Brentwood.
- Seven (7) districts are in the low range of 80.6 – 91.1% of students in the Basic and Below Basic category: Ferguson-Florissant, Hazelwood, Jennings, Normandy, Ritenour, Riverview Gardens and University City.
- The range of students in Basic and Below Basic for partner districts was 46.6 % to 91.1%. SSD had 32.7% in Basic and Below Basic.



**Table 5H(2): St. Louis County Students with Disabilities – MAP and MAP A Math Disaggregated by Gender**

	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>
MAP Proficient and Advanced	28.4%	34.05%

- 28.4% of the students with IEPs taking MAP and MAP A who scored Proficient and Advanced were female.
- 34.05% of students with IEPs taking MAP and MAP A who scored Proficient and Advanced were male.

**Table 6H(2): St. Louis County Students with Disabilities – MAP and MAP A Math Disaggregated by Disability Area**

<b>Disability</b>	<b>Total – Proficient and Advanced</b>	<b>Map</b>	<b>Map A</b>
Autism*	48.9%	37%	92.4%
Behavior Disorder	24.5%	22.2%	100%
Blind **	43.8%	40%	100%
Hearing Impaired	35.9%	34.7%	75%
Language Impaired	18.2%	17.6%	90.9%
Learning Disabled	21.2%	20.8%	100%
Mental Retardation*	42.4%	.4%	93.5%
Multi handicapped*	78.7%	10%	89.2%
Other HI	21.3%	19.9%	91.3%
Physically Impaired**	45.1%	40.4%	100%
Speech Impaired	60.6%	60.5%	100%
TBI**	17.2%	0%	100%

\*Categories had more than 100 students taking MAP A. \*\*Fewer than 100 students in combined MAP and MAP A.

- The range across the disability categories of those students with IEPs scoring Proficient and Advanced was 17.2% to 60.6% for the combined MAP and MAP A.
- The range across the disability categories of those students scoring Proficient and Advanced for MAP only was .4% to 60.5%.
- The range across the disability categories of those students scoring Proficient and Advanced for MAP A only was 75% to 100%.
- The differential between MAP and MAP A scores across all disability categories ranged from 40.3 to 100.
- The categories within the top third of students scoring Proficient and Advanced for combined scores by disability are Multi-Handicapped, Speech Impaired, Blind, Autism and Physically Impaired.
- The categories within the mid third of students scoring Proficient and Advanced for combined scores by disability are Blind, Intellectual Disability, Hearing Impaired and Emotional Disturbance.
- The categories within the low third of students scoring Proficient and Advanced for combined scores by disability are Other Health Impaired, Learning Disabled, TBI and Language Impaired.

**Disaggregated by District & SSD: Grade Level (Elementary Grade 3,4,5):**

**Proficient & Advanced:**

**Table 7H(2): St. Louis County Special Education by District and SSD – Grade-Level MAP Math (Elementary) (Range and Number of Districts)**

	<b>Grade 3</b>		<b>Grade 4</b>		<b>Grade 5</b>	
Top 33%	51% - 68%	8	44.9% - 100.0%	8	40.0% - 66.7%	8
Mid 33%	30% – 47%	8	27.8% - 42.0 %	7	23.0% - 40%	8
Low 33%	12% - 30%	7	10.3% - 26.3%	8	7.1% - 22.2%	7

**Grade 3:**

- Eight (8) districts representing the top 33% in Grade 3 had between 51% and 68% of students with disabilities score in the Proficient and Advanced levels of MAP Math: SSD, Valley Park, Lindbergh, Hancock Place, Clayton, Ladue, Brentwood and Kirkwood.
- Eight (8) districts representing the middle 33% had between 30% and 47% scoring in the top two levels of MAP Math: Rockwood, Parkway, Webster Groves, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Jennings, Affton Hazelwood and Pattonville.
- Seven (7) districts representing the lower 33% had between 12% and 30% scoring in Proficient and Advanced in MAP Math: Mehlville, Ritenour, Bayless, Ferguson-Florissant, University City, Normandy and Riverview Gardens.

**Grade 4:**

- Eight (8) districts representing the top 33% in Grade 4 had between 45% and 100% scoring in the Proficient and Advanced levels of MAP Math: Hancock Place, Clayton, SSD, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Lindbergh, Rockwood, Kirkwood and Parkway.
- Seven (7) districts representing the mid 33% had between 28% and 42% of students scoring in Proficient and Advanced: Ladue, Webster Groves, Affton, Pattonville, University City, Valley Park and Mehlville.
- Eight (8) districts representing the low 33% had between 10% - 26% scoring in the top two levels of MAP Math: Ritenour, Jennings, Hazelwood, Normandy, Ferguson-Florissant, Brentwood and Riverview Gardens.

**Grade 5:**

- Eight (8) districts representing the top 33% in Grade 5 had between 40% and 67% of students with disabilities scoring in the Proficient and Advanced levels of MAP Math: SSD, Lindbergh, Ladue, Clayton, Rockwood, Kirkwood, Affton and Parkway.
- Eight (8) districts representing the middle 33% had between 23% and 40% of students in the top two levels of MAP Math: Pattonville, Webster Groves, Brentwood, Mehlville, Hazelwood, Hancock Place, Bayless and Ritenour.

- Seven (7) districts representing the lower 33% had between 7% and 22% of students in the Proficient and Advanced levels of MAP Math: Ferguson-Florissant, Normandy, Hazelwood, Jennings, Ritenour, Riverview Gardens and University City.

#### **Disaggregated by District & SSD: Grade Level (Middle Level – Grades 6, 7 and 8):**

##### **Proficient & Advanced:**

**Table 8H(2): St. Louis County Students with Disabilities – Proficient and Advanced MAP and MAP A for Math by Grade (Middle School)**

	<b>Grade 6 – Range/ Number of Districts</b>	<b>Grade 7 – Range/ Number of Districts</b>	<b>Grade 8 – Range/ Number of Districts</b>
Top	39.1-57.5% / 8	37.3-75.4% / 8	28.6 – 70.8% / 8
Mid	19.4-37.5% / 7	21.6 – 36.8%/ 8	16- 27.3% / 8
Low	0-17.8% / 8	0 – 20.7% / 7	0-14.3% / 7

##### **Grade 6:**

- The range for partner districts and SSD for Grade 6 is 0 to 57.5% of students with disabilities scoring in Proficient and Advanced for MAP Math.
- Eight (8) districts including SSD had students in the Proficient and Advanced range of performance in the top third of districts: Affton, Clayton, Kirkwood, Lindbergh, Parkway, Rockwood, Valley Park and SSD.
- Seven (7) districts had students in the Proficient and Advanced range of performance in the middle third of districts: Bayless, Hancock Place, Hazelwood, Ladue, Mehlville, Pattonville and Webster Groves.
- Eight (8) districts had students in the Proficient and Advanced range of performance in the low third of districts: Brentwood, Ferguson-Florissant, Jennings, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Normandy, Ritenour, Riverview Garden and University City.

##### **Grade 7:**

- The range for partner districts for Grade 7 for students with disabilities scoring Proficient and Advanced for MAP Math is 0-75.4%.
- Eight (8) partner districts and SSD had students in the Proficient range of performance in the top third of districts: Brentwood, Clayton, Kirkwood, Ladue, Lindbergh, Rockwood, Valley Park and SSD.
- Eight (8) partner districts had students in the Proficient range of performance in the mid third of districts: Affton, Hazelwood, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Mehlville, Parkway, Pattonville, Ritenour and Webster Groves.
- Seven (7) partner districts had students in the Proficient range of performance in the low third of districts: Bayless, Ferguson-Florissant, Hancock Place, Jennings, Normandy, Riverview Gardens and University City.

### Grade 8:

- The range for partner districts for Grade 8 for students with disabilities scoring Proficient and Advanced for MAP Math is 3.3 to 70.8%.
- Eight (8) partner districts and SSD had students in the Proficient and Advanced range of performance in the top third of districts: Brentwood, Clayton, Lindbergh, Mehlville, Parkway, SSD, Valley Park and Webster Groves.
- Eight (8) partner districts had students in the Proficient and Advanced range of performance in the mid range of districts: Affton, Bayless, Hancock Place, Hazelwood, Kirkwood, Ladue, Pattonville and Rockwood.
- Seven (7) partner districts had students in the Proficient and Advanced range of performance in the low range of districts: Ferguson-Florissant, Jennings, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Normandy, Ritenour, Riverview Gardens and University City.

### Disaggregated by District & SSD: Grade Level (HS EOC – AI, GEO):

#### Proficient & Advanced:

**Table 9H(2): Math EOC for Partner Districts (High School)**

	<b>Algebra 1 – Range/Number of Districts</b>		<b>Geometry – Range/Number of Districts</b>	
High	42.1 – 100%	7	75- 100%	4
Mid	15.4- 40%	8	21.2 – 50%	4
Low	0 – 10.6%	8	0 - 14.3%	6

#### Algebra 1:

- The range for students with disabilities in EOC – Algebra 1 is 0 to 100% in the Proficient and Advanced range with all partner districts and SSD reporting results.
- Seven (7) partner districts had students in the Proficient and Advanced range of performance in the top third of districts: Brentwood, Clayton, Kirkwood, Lindbergh, Parkway, Rockwood and Valley Park.
- Eight (8) partner districts had students in the Proficient and Advanced range of performance in the mid third of districts: Affton, Bayless, Hancock Place, Ladue, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Mehlville, Pattonville and Webster Groves.
- Eight (8) districts and SSD had students in the Proficient and Advanced range of performance in the low third of districts: Ferguson-Florissant, Hazelwood, Jennings, Normandy, Ritenour, Riverview Gardens, SSD and University City.

#### Geometry:

- The range for students with disabilities in EOC – Geometry is 0 to 100% with only 14 districts reporting results. SSD did not have results reported for Geometry.
- Four (4) districts had students in the Proficient and Advanced range of performance in the top range of scores: Bayless, Parkway, Pattonville and Rockwood.

- Four (4) districts had students in the Proficient and Advanced range of performance in the mid range of scores: Affton, Ladue, Maplewood Richmond Heights and Valley Park.
- Six (6) districts had students in the Proficient and Advanced range of performance in the low range of scores: Brentwood, Hancock Place, Hazelwood, Jennings, Ritenour and University City.

#### **Other:**

- Only four (4) districts reported results for students with disabilities for EOC – Algebra II.
- Nineteen (19) districts including SSD reported scores for Grade 10, although 15 of those districts had less than 10 students reported. The range of score was 0 to 100%. Due to the low number for most districts and the wide range, these results were not disaggregated by district. Although, it should be noted that 4 districts with an *n* above 10 did have scores ranging from 84.6% to 100% of students with disabilities scoring in the Proficient and Advanced range: Hazelwood, Parkway, Rockwood and SSD.

#### **Disaggregated by District: Poverty**

#### **Disaggregated by District & SSD: Socio – Economic Status (Not Free/Reduced):**

##### **Below Basic & Basic:**

- Eight (8) districts representing the top 33% had between 40% and 55% of students scoring in the Below Basic and Basic levels of proficiency in MAP Math: Clayton, Lindbergh, Valley Park, Hancock Place, Parkway, Kirkwood, Pattonville and Rockwood.
- Eight (8) districts representing the mid 33% had 56% to 76% of students score in the Basic and Below Basic levels of Math: Ladue, Webster Groves, Affton, Brentwood, Mehlville, University City, Maplewood Richmond Heights and Bayless.
- Seven (7) districts representing the lower third of districts had between 79% and 100% of students score in the lowest two levels of MAP Math: Hazelwood, Ritenour, Ferguson-Florissant, SSD, Riverview Gardens, Jennings and Normandy.

##### **Proficient & Advanced:**

- Eight (8) districts representing the top 33% had between 44% and 60% of students with disabilities score in the top two levels of MAP Math: Clayton, Lindbergh, Valley Park, Hancock Place, Parkway, Kirkwood, Rockwood and Ladue.
- Eight (8) districts representing the middle 33% had between 24% and 43% of students score in the top two levels of MAP Math: Pattonville, Webster Groves, Brentwood, Affton, Mehlville, University City, Maplewood Richmond Heights and Bayless.
- Seven (7) districts representing the lower 33% had 0 to 22% score in the top two levels: Hazelwood, Ritenour, Ferguson-Florissant, SSD, Jennings, Riverview Gardens and Normandy.

**Table 10H(2): St. Louis County Special Education by District and SSD – SES Not Free-and-Reduced Lunch – MAP Math (Range)**

	<b>Below Basic / Basic</b>		<b>Proficient / Advanced</b>	
Top 33%	39.6% - 65.6%	8	43.8% - 60.4%	8
Mid 33%	56.2% - 75.7%	8	24.4% - 43.4%	8
Low 33%	78.5% - 100.0%	7	0.0% - 21.5%	7

**Disaggregated by District & SSD: Socio – Economic Status (Free/Reduced):**

**Below Basic & Basic:**

- Eight (8) districts representing the top 33% had between 61% and 80% of students with disabilities score in the Below Basic & Basic levels of Math MAP: Lindbergh, Affton, Brentwood, Valley Park, Hancock Place, Kirkwood, Maplewood Richmond Heights and Clayton.
- Eight (8) districts representing the middle 33% had between 81% and 88% of students who scored in the lower two levels of MAP Math: Pattonville, Bayless, Parkway, Rockwood, Ladue, Mehlville, Ritenour and SSD.
- Seven (7) districts representing the lower 33% had between 88% and 95% of students scoring in Below Basic and Basic: Jennings, Webster Groves, Hazelwood, Ferguson-Florissant, University City, Normandy and Riverview Gardens.

**Proficient & Advanced:**

- Seven (7) districts representing the top 33% had between 21% and 37% of students with disabilities who scored in the Proficient and Advanced levels of MAP Math: Brentwood, Lindbergh, Kirkwood, Webster Groves, Clayton, Affton and Bayless.
- Eight (8) districts representing the middle 33% had between 12% and 19% who scored in the Proficient and Advanced levels of MAP math: Hancock Place, Pattonville, Valley Park, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Ritenour, Mehlville, Parkway and Rockwood.
- Seven (7) districts representing the lower 33% had between 3% and 11% of students scoring in the top two levels of MAP Math: Jennings, Hazelwood, Ferguson-Florissant, University City, Normandy, SSD, Ladue and Riverview Gardens.

**Table 11H(2): St. Louis County Special Education by District and SSD – SES Free-and-Reduced Lunch – MAP Math (Range and Number of Districts)**

	<b>Below Basic / Basic</b>		<b>Proficient / Advanced</b>	
Top 33%	61.4% - 79.5%	8	20.6% - 36.6%	7
Mid 33%	81.0% - 87.8%	8	12.1% - 19.0%	8
Low 33%	88.4% - 95.0%	7	3.2% - 11.1%	8

### **Disaggregated by District & SSD: Ethnicity - African American:**

#### **Below Basic & Basic:**

- Eight (8) districts representing the top 33% had between 67% and 88% of students with disabilities score in the Proficient and Advanced levels of MAP Math: Hancock Place, Lindbergh, Valley Park, Bayless, Clayton, Kirkwood, Pattonville and SSD.
- Eight (8) districts representing the middle 33% had between 89% and 92% of students scoring in the Proficient and Advanced levels: Parkway, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Jennings, Hazelwood, Rockwood, Webster Groves, Ferguson-Florissant and Ritenour.
- Seven (7) districts representing the lower 33% had between 92% and 100% score in the top two levels of MAP Math: Affton, Ladue, University City, Normandy, Riverview Gardens, Mehlville and Brentwood.

#### **Proficient & Advanced:**

- Eight (8) districts representing the top 33% had between 12% and 33% of students with disabilities scored in the Proficient and Advanced levels of MAP: Hancock Place, Lindbergh, Valley Park, Bayless, Clayton, Kirkwood, Pattonville and SSD.
- Eight (8) districts representing the middle 33% had between 8% and 11% of students score in the top two levels of MAP: Maplewood Richmond Heights, Rockwood, Parkway, Hazelwood, Jennings, Webster Groves, Ritenour and Ferguson-Florissant.
- Seven (7) districts represented the lower 33% with a range of 0 to 8% of students at the Proficient and Advanced levels: Affton, Ladue, University City, Normandy, Riverview Gardens, Mehlville and Brentwood.

**Table 12H(2): St. Louis County Special Education by District and SSD – Ethnicity Black – MAP Math (Range and Number of Districts)**

	<b>Below Basic / Basic</b>		<b>Proficient / Advanced</b>	
Top 33%	66.6% - 87.8%	8	12.2% - 33.3%	8
Mid 33%	89.3% - 91.7%	8	8.1% - 10.5%	8
Low 33%	92.0% - 100%	7	0.0% - 8.0%	7

### **Disaggregated by District & SSD: Ethnicity – Caucasian:**

#### **Below Basic & Basic:**

- Eight (8) districts representing the top 33% had between 37% and 56% of students with disabilities score in the Basic and Below Basic levels of MAP Math: University City, Lindbergh, Brentwood, Valley Park, Kirkwood, Parkway, Ladue and Rockwood.
- Eight (8) districts representing the middle 33% had between 57% and 71% of students score in the lower two levels of MAP Math: Webster Groves, Affton, Pattonville, Jennings, Hancock Place, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Mehlville and Clayton.

- Seven (7) districts representing the lower 33% had between 73% and 100% of students scoring in Below Basic and Basic: Hazelwood, Ferguson-Florissant, Bayless, Ritenour, SSD, Riverview Gardens and Normandy.

**Proficient & Advanced:**

- Eight (8) districts representing the top 33% had between 44% and 63% of students with disabilities score in the Proficient and Advanced levels of MAP Math: Clayton, University City, Lindbergh, Brentwood, Valley Park, Kirkwood, Parkway and Ladue.
- Eight (8) districts representing the middle 33% had between 29% and 44% of students score in the top two levels of Math MAP: Rockwood, Webster Groves, Affton, Pattonville, Jennings, Hancock Place, Maplewood Richmond Heights and Mehlville.
- Seven (7) districts representing the lower 33% had between 5% and 28% of students score in the Proficient and Advanced levels: Hazelwood, Ferguson-Florissant, Bayless, Ritenour, SSD, Riverview Gardens and Normandy.

**Table 13H(2): St. Louis County Special Education by District and SSD – Ethnicity Caucasian – MAP Math (Range and Number of Districts)**

	<b>Below Basic / Basic</b>		<b>Proficient / Advanced</b>	
Top 33%	36.6% - 56.2%	8	44.0% - 63.4%	8
Mid 33%	44.0% - 45.2%	8	28.9% - 43.6%	8
Low 33%	46.7% - 100.0%	7	0.0% - 28.4%	7



## APPENDIX I: POST-SCHOOL OUTCOMES

### FINDINGS

Guiding Questions for Sub-Committee on *Special Education Outcomes* – Do students with disabilities achieve acceptable outcomes with respect to academic achievement and other measures associated with the Performance Categories associated with the IDEA? What factors lead to the higher achievement and better outcomes for students served by the SSD?

**Question 5.** What are the post-secondary follow-up data for students with disabilities served by SSD as a whole and disaggregated by district? Are there differences with this data for race, gender, poverty and disability?

**Table 1I: St. Louis County IEPs – Post-School Outcomes**

<b>St. Louis County IEPs</b> <b>Higher Ed; Competitively Employed/Military; Non-Competitively Employed/</b> <b>Non-College or Non-Advanced Training; &amp; Other</b>				
<b>Higher Ed</b>	<b>Comp Empl &amp; Military</b>	<b>Non-comp Empl/NCT</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>IEP Grads</b>
50.3%	16.9%	4.0%	28.7%	1861

50% of students were identified as having enrolled in higher education\*, 17% were identified as competitively employed or in the military, 4% were identified as participating in non-competitive employment or non-college training, and 29% were identified as other.\*\*

\*higher education = 2-year and 4-year college/university enrollment

\*\*other = not available, other, and unknown

**Table 2I: St. Louis County IEPs – Post-School Outcomes by District**

<b>St. Louis County IEPs by District</b> <b>Higher Ed; Competitively Employed/Military; Non-Competitively Employed/</b> <b>Non-College or Non-Advanced Training; &amp; Other</b>				
<b>Range</b>	<b>Higher Ed</b>	<b>Comp Empl &amp; Military</b>	<b>Non-comp Empl/ NCT</b>	<b>Other</b>
>75 %	4	0	0	0
25% to 75%	16	0	0	12
< 25%	3	23	23	11

- Three (3) districts reported that less than 25% of their students were identified as having enrolled in higher education: Normandy, Riverview and SSD; in sixteen (16) districts, 25% to 75% of students

identified as having enrolled in higher education: Affton, Bayless, Brentwood, Ferguson-Florissant, Hancock Place, Hazelwood, Jennings, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Mehlville, Parkway, Pattonville, Ritenour, Rockwood, University City, Valley Park and Webster Groves; in four (4) districts, 75% to 100% of students identified as having enrolled in higher education: Clayton, Kirkwood, Ladue and Lindbergh.

- All districts reported that less than 25% of their students were identified as competitively employed or in the military, except for seven (7) districts who reported 25% to 75% of their students as competitively employed or in the military: Affton, Bayless, Hancock Place, Jennings, Ritenour, Riverview Gardens and Valley Park.
- All districts reported that less than 25% of their students were identified as participating in non-competitive employment or non-college training.
- All districts reported that less than 25% of their students were identified as other, except for twelve (12) districts, who reported that 25% to 75% of their students were identified as other: Affton, Ferguson-Florissant, Hazelwood, Jennings, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Normandy, Pattonville, Ritenour, Riverview Gardens, Rockwood, SSD and University City.

53% of students were identified as Not Asian or White, and 47% were identified as Asian/White.

**Table 3I: St. Louis County IEPs – Post-School Outcomes by Ethnicity**

<b>St. Louis County IEPs by Ethnicity</b>				
<b>Higher Ed; Competitively Employed/Military; Non-Competitively Employed/Non-College or Non-Advanced Training; &amp; Other</b>				
<b>IEP Grads</b>	<b>Higher Ed</b>	<b>Comp Empl &amp; Military</b>	<b>Non-comp Empl/NCT</b>	<b>Other</b>
Not Asian or White	43.8%	16.6%	4.9%	34.7%
Asian or White	57.7%	17.3%	3.0%	22.1%

- Of Not Asian or White students, 44% were identified as enrolled in higher education; 17% were identified as competitively employed or in the military; 5% were identified as participating in non-competitive employment or non-college training; and 35% were identified as other.
- Of Asian/White students, 58% were identified as enrolled in higher education; 17% were identified as competitively employed or in the military; 3% were identified as participating in non-competitive employment or non-college training; and 22% were identified as other.

**Table 4I: St. Louis County IEPs – Post-School Outcomes by Ethnicity (Not Asian or White)**

<b>St. Louis County IEPs by District – Ethnicity: Not Asian or White Higher Ed; Competitively Employed/Military; Non-Competitively Employed/ Non-College or Non-Advanced Training; &amp; Other</b>				
<b>Range</b>	<b>High Ed</b>	<b>Comp Empl &amp; Military</b>	<b>Non-comp Empl/ NCT</b>	<b>Other</b>
>75 %	4	0	0	0
25% to 75%	16	5	0	12
< 25%	3	18	23	11

- Of Not Asian or White students, all districts reported that more than 25% of their students were identified as having enrolled in higher education, except three (3) districts that reported that less than 25% of students enrolled in higher education: Normandy, Riverview and SSD. In sixteen (16) districts, 25 to 75% of students were identified as having enrolled in higher education: Affton, Brentwood, Ferguson-Florissant, Hancock Place, Hazelwood, Jennings, Kirkwood, Ladue, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Mehlville, Parkway, Pattonville, Ritenour, Rockwood, University City and Webster Groves; and in four (4) districts, 75 to 100% of students were identified as having enrolled in higher education: Bayless, Clayton, Lindbergh and Valley Park.
- Of Not Asian or White students, all districts reported that less than 25% of their students were identified as competitively employed or in the military, except five (5) districts that reported that 25 to 75% of students were identified as competitively employed or in the military: Hancock Place, Jennings, Maplewood, Ritenour and Riverview Gardens.
- Of Not Asian or White students, all districts reported that less than 25% of their students were identified as participating in non-competitive employment or non-college training.
- Of Not Asian or White students, all districts reported that less than 25% of their students were identified as other, except for twelve (12) districts who reported that 25% to 75% of students were identified as other: Bayless, Ferguson-Florissant, Hazelwood, Jennings, Normandy, Pattonville, Ritenour, Riverview Gardens, Rockwood, SSD, University City and Webster Groves.

**Table 5I: St. Louis County IEPs – Post-School Outcomes by Ethnicity (Asian or White)**

<b>St. Louis County IEPs by District – Ethnicity: Asian or White Higher Ed; Competitively Employed/Military; Non-Competitively Employed/ Non-College or Non-Advanced Training; &amp; Other</b>				
<b>Range</b>	<b>High Ed</b>	<b>Comp Empl &amp; Military</b>	<b>Non-comp Empl/ NCT</b>	<b>Other</b>
>75 %	4	0	0	0
25% to 75%	15	6	0	8
< 25%	4	17	23	15

- Of Asian or White students, all districts reported that more than 25% of their students were identified as having enrolled in higher education, except four (4) districts who reported that less than 25% of students were identified as having enrolled in higher education: Hancock, Jennings, Normandy and SSD. In fifteen (15) districts, 25 to 75% of students were identified as having enrolled in higher education: Affton, Bayless, Brentwood, Ferguson-Florissant, Hazelwood, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Mehlville, Parkway, Pattonville, Ritenour, Riverview, Rockwood, University City, Valley Park and Webster Groves; and in four (4) districts, 75 to 100% of students were identified as having enrolled in higher education: Clayton, Kirkwood, Ladue and Lindbergh.
- Of Asian or White students, all districts reported that less than 25% of their students were identified as competitively employed or in the military, except for six (6) districts who reported that 25 to 75% of students were competitively employed or in the military: Affton, Bayless, Hancock Place, Ritenour, Riverview and Valley Park.
- Of Asian or White students, all districts reported that less than 25% of their students were identified as participating in non-competitive employment or non-college training.
- Of Asian or White students, all districts reported that less than 25% of their students were identified as other, except for eight (8) districts that reported that 25% to 75% of students were identified as other: Affton, Ferguson-Florissant, Hazelwood, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Pattonville, Ritenour, SSD and University City.

It was reported that 37.3% of all students served by SSD were female, and that 62.7% were male.

**Table 6I: St. Louis County IEPs – Post-School Outcomes by Gender**

<b>St. Louis County IEPs by District – Gender</b> <b>Higher Ed; Competitively Employed/Military; Non-Competitively Employed/</b> <b>Non-College or Non-Advanced Training; &amp; Other</b>				
<b>IEP Grads</b>	<b>Higher Ed</b>	<b>Comp Empl &amp; Military</b>	<b>Non-comp Empl Cont Ed</b>	<b>Other</b>
Females	57.3%	12.7%	4.3%	25.8%
Males	46.2%	19.5%	3.8%	30.5%

- Of the female students, 57% were identified as having enrolled in higher education; 13% were identified as competitively employed or in the military; 4% were identified as participating in non-competitive employment or non-college training; and 26% were identified as other.
- Of the male students, 46% were identified as having enrolled in higher education, 20% were identified as competitively employed or in the military, 4% were identified as participating in non-competitive employment or training, and 31% were identified as other.

**Table 7I: St. Louis County IEPs – Post-School Outcomes – Females**

<b>St. Louis County IEPs by District – Gender: Females</b> <b>Higher Ed; Competitively Employed/Military; Non-Competitively Employed/</b> <b>Non-College or Non-Advanced Training; &amp; Other</b>				
<b>Range</b>	<b>Higher Ed</b>	<b>Comp Empl &amp; Military</b>	<b>Non-comp Empl/ NCT</b>	<b>Other</b>
>75 %	3	1	0	0
25% to 75%	19	5	2	13
< 25%	1	17	21	10

- All districts reported that more than 25% of female students were identified as having enrolled in higher education, except one (1) district that identified that less than 25% of its students were identified as having enrolled in higher education: SSD. In all other districts, 25% to 75% of students were identified as having enrolled in higher education, except three (3) districts that reported that 75% to 100% of students were identified as having enrolled in higher education: Clayton, Kirkwood and Ladue.
- All districts reported that fewer than 25% of female students were identified as competitively employed or in the military, except five (5) districts that reported that 25% to 75% of students were identified as competitively employed or in the military: Affton, Bayless, Jennings, Riverview Gardens and Valley Park. One district reported that 75% to 100% of its students were identified as competitively employed or in the military: Hancock Place.

- All districts reported that less than 25% of female students were identified as participating in non-competitive employment or non-college training, except two (2) districts that reported that 25% to 75% of students were identified as participating in non-competitive employment or training: Bayless and Maplewood Richmond Heights.
- All districts reported that fewer than 25% of female students were identified as other, except thirteen (13) districts that reported that 25% to 75% of students were identified as other: Affton, Brentwood, Ferguson-Florissant, Jennings, Normandy, Pattonville, Ritenour, Riverview Gardens, Rockwood, SSD, University City, Valley Park and Webster Groves.

**Table 8I: St. Louis County IEPs – Post-School Outcomes – Males**

<b>St. Louis County IEPs by District – Gender: Males Higher Ed; Competitively Employed/Military; Non-Competitively Employed/ Non-College or Non-Advanced Training; &amp; Other</b>				
<b>Range</b>	<b>Higher Ed</b>	<b>Comp Empl &amp; Military</b>	<b>Non-comp Empl/ NCT</b>	<b>Other</b>
>75 %	5	0	0	0
25% to 75%	14	6	0	12
< 25%	4	17	23	11

- All districts reported that more than 25% of male students were identified as having enrolled in higher education, except four (4) districts that reported that less than 25% of students were identified as having enrolled in higher education: Normandy, Ritenour, Riverview Gardens and SSD. All other districts reported that 25% – 75% of students were identified as having enrolled in higher education, except five (5) districts that reported that 75% to 100% of students were identified as having enrolled in higher education: Clayton, Kirkwood, Ladue, Lindbergh and Valley Park.
- All districts reported that less than 25% of male students were identified as competitively employed or in the military, except six (6) districts who reported that 25% to 75% of students were identified as competitively employed or in the military: Affton, Bayless, Hancock Place, Jennings, Ritenour and Riverview Gardens.
- All districts reported that less than 25% of male students were identified as participating in non-competitive employment or non-college training.
- All districts reported that less than 25% of male students were identified as other, except twelve (12) districts that reported that 25% to 75% of students were identified as other: Affton, Ferguson-Florissant, Hazelwood, Jennings, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Normandy, Pattonville, Ritenour, Riverview Gardens, Rockwood, SSD and University City.

**Table 9I: St. Louis County IEPs – Post-School Outcomes – Poverty/SES**

<b>St. Louis County IEPs – Poverty/SES Higher Ed; Competitively Employed/Military; Non-Competitively Employed/ Non-College or Non-Advanced Training; &amp; Other</b>				
<b>IEP Grads</b>	<b>Higher Ed</b>	<b>Comp Empl &amp; Military</b>	<b>Non-comp Empl/ NCT</b>	<b>Other</b>
Not Free-Reduced-Lunch	63.3%	15.8%	2.3%	18.6%
Free-Reduced-Lunch	43.2%	19.1%	4.4%	33.3%

- In St. Louis County, of the Not Free/Reduced Lunch students, 63% were identified as having enrolled in higher education, 16% were identified as competitively employed or in the military, 2% were identified as participating in non-competitive employment or non-college training, and 19% were identified as other.
- In St. Louis County, of the Free/Reduced Lunch students, 43% were identified as having enrolled in higher education, 19% were identified as competitively employed or in the military, 4% were identified as participating in non-competitive employment or non-college training, and 33% were identified as other.

**Table 10I: St. Louis County IEPs – Post-School Outcomes – Poverty/SES:  
Not Free/Reduced Lunch**

<b>St. Louis County IEPs by District – Poverty/SES Not Free/Reduced Lunch Higher Ed; Competitively Employed/Military; Non-Competitively Employed/ Non-College or Non-Advanced Training; &amp; Other</b>				
<b>Range</b>	<b>Higher Ed</b>	<b>Comp Empl &amp; Military</b>	<b>Non-comp Empl/ NCT</b>	<b>Other</b>
>75 %	5	0	0	0
25% to 75%	17	8	0	9
< 25%	1	15	23	14

- All districts reported that 25% to 75% of their Not Free/Reduced Lunch students were identified as having enrolled in higher education, except for one (1) district: SSD, that reported that < 25% of its Not Free/Reduced Lunch students had enrolled in higher education, and five (5) districts: Clayton, Lindbergh, Ladue, Kirkwood and Webster Groves, that reported that > 75% of its Not Free/Reduced Lunch students had enrolled in higher education.
- All districts reported that < 25% of their Not Free/Reduced Lunch students were identified as competitively employed or in the military, except for eight (8) districts that reported that 25% to 75% of its Not Free/Reduced Lunch students were identified as competitively employed or in the military: Bayless, Hancock Place, Riverview Gardens, Jennings, SSD, Ritenour, Affton and Valley Park.

- All districts reported that < 25% of their Not Free/Reduced Lunch students were participating in non-competitive employment or non-college training.
- All districts reported that < 25% of their Not Free/Reduced Lunch students were identified as other, except for nine (9) that reported that 25% to 75% were identified as other: University City, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Ferguson-Florissant, SSD, Ritenour, Normandy, Pattonville, Jennings and Affton.

**Table 11I: St. Louis County IEPs – Post-School Outcomes – Poverty/SES by District:  
Free/Reduced Lunch**

<b>St. Louis County IEPs by District – Poverty/SES – Free/Reduced Lunch Higher Ed; Competitively Employed/Military; Non-Competitively Employed/ Non-College or Non-Advanced Training; &amp; Other</b>				
<b>Range</b>	<b>Higher Ed</b>	<b>Comp Empl &amp; Military</b>	<b>Non-comp Empl/ NCT</b>	<b>Other</b>
>75 %	1	1	0	0
25% to 75%	19	9	0	13
< 25%	3	13	23	10

- All districts reported that 25% to 75% of their Free/Reduced Lunch students were enrolled in higher education, except for one (1) district that reported > 75% of its students in higher education: Clayton; and three (3) districts that reported that < 25% of its students in higher education: Normandy, Hancock Place and Ladue.
- All districts reported that < 25% of its Free/Reduced Lunch students were competitively employed or in the military, except for one (1) district that reported > 75%: Ladue; and nine (9) districts that reported 25 to 75%: Hancock Place, Affton, Valley Park, Jennings, Ritenour, SSD, Riverview Gardens, Mehlville and Normandy.
- All districts reported that < 25% of their Free/Reduced Lunch students participated in non-competitive employment or non-college training.
- All districts reported that 25% to 75% of their Free/Reduced Lunch students were identified as other, except for ten (10) that were < 25% other: Brentwood, Parkway, Kirkwood, Hancock Place, Bayless, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Mehlville, Lindbergh, Clayton and Ladue.



**Table 12I: Post-School Outcomes by District and Diagnosis**

<b>Disability</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Higher Ed</b>	<b>Comp Empl &amp; Military</b>	<b>Non-Comp Empl/ NCT</b>	<b>Other</b>
Autism	77	55.8%	13.0%	6.5%	24.7%
Behavior Disorder	185	52.4%	14.6%	2.7%	30.3%
Blind	3	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%
Deaf/Blind	1	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hearing Impaired	18	88.9%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%
Language Impaired	106	66.0%	19.8%	3.8%	10.4%
Learning Disabled	892	54.3%	18.6%	3.1%	24.0%
Mental Retardation	87	20.7%	21.8%	6.9%	50.6%
Multi-Handicapped	6	83.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%
Other-Health Impaired	272	55.1%	15.4%	2.6%	26.8%
Physically Impaired	6	83.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%
Speech Impaired	17	47.1%	35.3%	0.0%	17.6%
Traumatic Brain Injury	4	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%

**Table 13I: Post-School Outcomes Disaggregated by District and Disability – Autism**

<b>St. Louis County IEPs by District – Disability: Autism</b> <b>Higher Ed; Competitively Employed/Military; Non-Competitively Employed/ Non-College or Non-Advanced Training; &amp; Other</b>				
<b>Range</b>	<b>Higher Ed</b>	<b>Comp Empl &amp; Military</b>	<b>Non-comp Empl/ NCT</b>	<b>Other</b>
>75 %	5	1	0	3
25% to 75%	10	4	2	6
< 25%	5	15	18	11

- Three (3) districts reported no students with ASD in any categories: Clayton, Hancock Place and Valley Park.
- Higher Education: All were 25% to 75%, except for five (5) > 75%: Brentwood, Kirkwood, Lindbergh, Mehlville and Webster Groves, and five (5) that were < 25%: Affton, Jennings, Normandy, SSD and University City.
- Competitively Employed: All were < 25%, except for one (1) district >75%: Affton and four (4) that were 25% to 75%: Hazelwood, Ritenour, Parkway and Riverview Gardens.
- Non-Competitively Employed: All were < 25%, except for two (2) that were 25 – 75%: Bayless and SSD.
- Other: All were < 25%, except for three (3) that were > 75%: Jennings, Normandy and University City; and six (6) that were 25% to 75%: SSD, Ferguson-Florissant, Pattonville, Rockwood, Maplewood Richmond Heights and Ladue.

**Table 14I: Post-School Outcomes Disaggregated by District and Disability – Behavior Disorder**

<b>St. Louis County IEPs by District – Disability: Behavior Disorder Higher Ed; Competitively Employed/Military; Non-Competitively Employed/ Non-College or Non-Advanced Training; &amp; Other</b>				
<b>Range</b>	<b>Higher Ed</b>	<b>Comp Empl &amp; Military</b>	<b>Non-comp Empl/ NCT</b>	<b>Other</b>
>75 %	1	0	0	0
25% to 75%	18	8	1	11
< 25%	2	13	20	10

- Two (2) school districts reported no students with Behavior Disorders in any categories: Bayless and Ladue.
- Higher Education: All were 25% to 75%, except for one (1) district that was > 75%: Valley Park; and two (2) districts with < 25%: SSD and Maplewood Richmond Heights.
- Competitively Employed: All were < 25%, except for eight (8) that were 25% to 75%: Affton, Brentwood, Hancock Place, Clayton, SSD, Normandy, Riverview Gardens and Mehlville.
- Non-Competitively Employed: All were < 25%, except for one (1) district that was 25% to 75%: Maplewood Richmond Heights.
- Other: All were 25% to 75%, except for ten (10) that were < 25%: Parkway, Pattonville, Hazelwood, Webster Groves, Mehlville, Affton, Brentwood, Clayton, Hancock Place and Valley Park.

**Table 15I: Post-School Outcomes Disaggregated by District and Disability – Hearing Impaired**

<b>St. Louis County IEPs by District – Disability: Hearing Impaired Higher Ed; Competitively Employed/Military; Non-Competitively Employed/ Non-College or Non-Advanced Training; &amp; Other</b>				
<b>Range</b>	<b>Higher Ed</b>	<b>Comp Empl &amp; Military</b>	<b>Non-Comp Empl/ NCT</b>	<b>Other</b>
>75 %	6	0	0	2
25% to 75%	0	0	0	0
< 25%	2	0	0	6

- Fifteen (15) districts reported no students with Hearing Impairment in any categories: Affton, Bayless, Brentwood, Clayton, Ferguson-Florissant, Hancock Place, Jennings, Kirkwood, Lindbergh, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Normandy, Riverview Gardens, SSD, University City and Valley Park.
- Higher Education: Of the eight (8) districts, six (6) were > 75%: Hazelwood, Ladue, Mehlville, Parkway, Ritenour and Rockwood; and two (2) were < 25%: Pattonville and Webster Groves.

- Competitively Employed: None
- Non-Competitively Employed: None
- Other: Of the eight (8) districts, six (6) < 25%: Hazelwood, Ladue, Mehlville, Parkway, Ritenour and Rockwood; and two (2) were > 75%: Pattonville and Webster Groves.

**Table 161: Post-School Outcomes Disaggregated by District and Disability – Language Impaired**

<b>St. Louis County IEPs by District – Disability: Language Impaired Higher Ed; Competitively Employed/Military; Non-Competitively Employed/ Non-College or Non-Advanced Training; &amp; Other</b>				
<b>Range</b>	<b>Higher Ed</b>	<b>Comp Empl &amp; Military</b>	<b>Non-Comp Empl/ NCT</b>	<b>Other</b>
>75 %	6	0	0	0
25% to 75%	10	9	2	4
< 25%	2	9	16	14

- Five (5) districts reported no students with Language Impairment in any categories: Brentwood, Hancock, Jennings, Valley Park and Webster Groves.
- Higher Education: All were 25% to 75%, except for six (6) districts that were > 75%: Clayton, Ladue, Mehlville, Ferguson-Florissant, Kirkwood, Rockwood; two (2) that were < 25%: Pattonville and Riverview Gardens.
- Competitively Employed: All were < 25%, except for nine (9) that were 25% to 75%: Riverview Gardens, Affton, Bayless, Pattonville, Ritenour, Lindbergh, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Normandy and Parkway.
- Non-Competitively Employed: All were < 25%, except for two (2) that were 25% to 75%: SSD and Maplewood Richmond Heights.
- Other: All were < 25% except for four (4) that were 25% to 75%: Pattonville, University City, Hazelwood and Riverview Gardens.

**Table 17I: Post-School Outcomes Disaggregated by District and Disability – Learning Disabilities**

<b>St. Louis County IEPs by District – Disability: Learning Disabilities Higher Ed; Competitively Employed/Military; Non-Competitively Employed/ Non-College or Non-Advanced Training; &amp; Other</b>				
<b>Range</b>	<b>Higher Ed</b>	<b>Comp Empl &amp; Military</b>	<b>Non-Comp Empl/ NCT</b>	<b>Other</b>
>75 %	4	0	0	0
25% to 75%	19	7	0	11
< 25%	1	16	23	12

- Higher Education: All were 25% to 75%, except for four (4) that were > 75%: Clayton, Ladue, Lindbergh and Kirkwood; and one (1) that was < 25%: Hancock Place.
- Competitively Employed: All were < 25%, except for seven (7) that were 25% to 75%: Hancock Place, Valley Park, SSD, Bayless, Jennings, Riverview Gardens and Ritenour.
- Non-Competitively Employed: All were < 25%.
- Other: All were < 25%, except for eleven (11) that were 25% to 75%: Ferguson-Florissant, Patton, Ritenour, University City, Affton, Normandy, Hazelwood, Riverview Gardens, Jennings, Maplewood Richmond Heights and Valley Park.

**Table 18I: Post-School Outcomes Disaggregated by District and Disability – Intellectual Disabilities (classified as Mental Retardation)**

<b>St. Louis County IEPs by District – Disability: Intellectual Disabilities Higher Ed; Competitively Employed/Military; Non-Competitively Employed/ Non-College or Non-Advanced Training; &amp; Other</b>				
<b>Range</b>	<b>Higher Ed</b>	<b>Comp Empl &amp; Military</b>	<b>Non-Comp Empl/ NCT</b>	<b>Other</b>
>75 %	0	1	0	5
25% to 75%	5	5	0	5
< 25%	10	9	15	5

- Eight (8) districts reported no students with Intellectual Disabilities (Mental Retardation) in any categories: Bayless, Brentwood, Clayton, Hancock Place, Kirkwood, Lindbergh, Valley Park and Webster Groves.
- Higher Education: All were < 25%, except for five (5) that were 25% to 75%: Mehlville, Hazelwood, Jennings, Parkway and University City.
- Competitively Employed: All were < 25%, except for five (5) that 25% to 75%: Jennings, Ritenour, Hazelwood, SSD and Mehlville; and one (1) that was > 75%: Affton.

- Non-Competitively Employed: All were < 25%.
- Other: Five (5) were > 75%: Ladue, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Pattonville, Rockwood and Ferguson-Florissant; five (5) were 25% to 75%: Riverview Gardens, SSD, University City, Ritenour and Normandy; and five (5) were < 25%: Parkway, Hazelwood, Affton, Jennings and Mehlville.

**Table 19I: Post-School Outcomes Disaggregated by District and Disability – Multi-Handicapped**

<b>St. Louis County IEPs by District – Disability: Multi-Handicapped Higher Ed; Competitively Employed/Military; Non-Competitively Employed/ Non-College or Non-Advanced Training; &amp; Other</b>				
<b>Range</b>	<b>Higher Ed</b>	<b>Comp Empl &amp; Military</b>	<b>Non-Comp Empl/ NCT</b>	<b>Other</b>
>75 %	3	0	0	0
25% to 75%	1	0	0	1
< 25%	0	4	4	3

- Only four (4) districts reported students with Multiple Disabilities: Hazelwood, Parkway, Riverview Gardens and Rockwood.
- Higher Education: All were > 75% except for one (1) district that was 25% to 75%: Rockwood.
- Competitively Employed: All were < 25%.
- Non-Competitively Employed: All were < 25%.
- Other: All were < 25%, except for one (1) that was 25% to 75%: Rockwood.

**Table 20I: Post-School Outcomes Disaggregated by District and Disability – Other Health Impaired**

<b>St. Louis County IEPs by District – Disability: Other Health Impaired Higher Ed; Competitively Employed/Military; Non-Competitively Employed/ Non-College or Non-Advanced Training; &amp; Other</b>				
<b>Range</b>	<b>Higher Ed</b>	<b>Comp Empl &amp; Military</b>	<b>Non-Comp Empl/ NCT</b>	<b>Other</b>
>75 %	5	1	0	1
25% to 75%	12	8	2	9
< 25%	5	13	20	12

- One (1) district reported no students with Other Health Impairment: University City.
- Higher Education: All were 25% to 75%, except for five (5) that were > 75%: Clayton, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Valley Park, Lindbergh and Ladue; and five (5) that were < 25%: Ritenour, Bayless, Hancock Place, Normandy and Riverview Gardens.

- Competitively Employed: All were < 25% except for one (1) that was > 75%: Hancock; and eight (8) that were 25% to 75%: Bayless, Kirkwood, Normandy, Jennings, Riverview Gardens, SSD, Affton and Pattonville.
- Non-Competitively Employed: All were < 25% except for two (2) that were 25% to 75%: SSD and Brentwood.
- Other: All were < 25% except for one (1) that was > 75%: Ritenour; and nine (9) that were 25% to 75%: Riverview Gardens, Ferguson-Florissant, Normandy, Bayless, Webster Groves, Hazelwood, Affton, Brentwood and Pattonville.

**Table 21I: Post-School Outcomes Disaggregated by District and Disability – Physically Disabilities (Physically Impaired)**

<b>St. Louis County IEPs by District – Disability: Physically Impaired Higher Ed; Competitively Employed/Military; Non-Competitively Employed/ Non-College or Non-Advanced Training; &amp; Other</b>				
<b>Range</b>	<b>Higher Ed</b>	<b>Comp Empl &amp; Military</b>	<b>Non-Comp Empl/ NCT</b>	<b>Other</b>
>75 %	4	0	0	1
25% to 75%	0	0	0	0
< 25%	1	5	5	4

- Only five (5) districts reported students with Physical Impairment: Ferguson-Florissant, Hancock Place, Normandy, Rockwood and University City.
- Higher Education: All were > 75%, except for one (1) that was < 25%: Rockwood.
- Competitively Employed: All were < 25%.
- Non-Competitively Employed: All were < 25%.
- Other: All were < 25% except for one (1) that was > 75%: Rockwood.

**Table 22I: Post-School Outcomes Disaggregated by District and Disability – Speech Impairment**

<b>St. Louis County IEPs by District – Disability: Speech Impairment Higher Ed; Competitively Employed/Military; Non-Competitively Employed/ Non-College or Non-Advanced Training; &amp; Other</b>				
<b>Range</b>	<b>Higher Ed</b>	<b>Comp Empl &amp; Military</b>	<b>Non-Comp Empl/ NCT</b>	<b>Other</b>
>75 %	5	2	0	1
25% to 75%	2	2	0	2
< 25%	4	7	11	8

- Twelve (2) districts reported no students with Speech Impairment: Bayless, Brentwood, Hancock Place, Ladue, Lindbergh, Maplewood Richmond Heights, Mehlville, Normandy, Pattonville, Riverview Gardens, SSD and Valley Park.
- Higher Education: All were > 75%, except for two (2) that were 25 – 75%: Parkway and Ritenour; and four (4) that were < 25%: Affton, Ferguson-Florissant, Rockwood and University City.
- Competitively Employed: All were < 25% except for two (2) that were > 75%: Rockwood and University City, and two (2) that were 25 – 75%: Ferguson-Florissant and Ritenour.
- Non-Competitively Employed: All were < 25%.
- Other: All were < 25%, except for one (1) that was > 75%: Affton; and two (2) that were 25% to 75%: Parkway and Ferguson-Florissant.

**Table 231: Post-School Outcomes Disaggregated by District and Disability – Traumatic Brain Injury**

<b>St. Louis County IEPs by District – Disability: Traumatic Brain Injury</b> <b>Higher Ed; Competitively Employed/Military; Non-Competitively Employed/</b> <b>Non-College or Non-Advanced Training; &amp; Other</b>				
<b>Range</b>	<b>Higher Ed</b>	<b>Comp Empl &amp; Military</b>	<b>Non-Comp Empl/ NCT</b>	<b>Other</b>
>75 %	2	0	0	2
25% to 75%	0	0	0	0
< 25%	2	4	4	2

- Only four (4) districts reported students with Traumatic Brain Injury: Bayless, Ferguson-Florissant, Rockwood and Webster Groves.
- Higher Education: All were < 25%, except for two (2) that were > 75%: Bayless and Rockwood.
- Competitively Employed: All were < 25%.
- Non-Competitively Employed: All were < 25%.
- Other: All were < 25%, except for two (2) that was > 75%: Ferguson-Florissant and Webster Groves.

## APPENDIX J: POLICY OPTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

At the conclusion of each section of the Special School District Equity Study, the project's team members offered a series of policy options and recommendations. These proposals are reprised in this appendix.

### Teacher Preparation and Quality – Policy Options and Recommendations

1. Essential questions relating to the use of the Perceiver System, Promotions and Transfers were not able to be addressed because of issues of data availability. If the Board desires further investigation relative to these areas, district staff must devise a data storage and analysis protocol that will support such an inquiry.
2. There has been a perception by some in St. Louis County that Special School District employees in North County districts are less qualified than in school districts in other parts of the county, and that teachers tend to transfer out of North County districts when other opportunities arise. The data suggests otherwise. The tables presented in this report demonstrate that 79% of all teachers hold at least a master's degree. When viewed at individual districts there is some variation, but the measure of central tendency is relatively stable from district to district. Ritenour is the district with the lowest percentage at 68%, followed by Central Administration at 72% and Normandy at 74%. Similarly the data on teacher longevity demonstrated that 54% of teachers in the district have been employed in the district for 10 years or more. Again the measure of central tendency was relative stable with the Ritenour and Webster Groves School Districts at the lowest levels with 42% and 45% respectively. Data regarding transfer requests were not available for compilation and analysis. Neither were aggregate/non-identifiable data on teacher evaluations. The district can consider the relative value of collecting and analyzing such data to provide a more definitive response to the questions of staff competence across the district.
3. Overall the district has recruited and employed a diverse workforce. The data demonstrate the level of diversity to be comparable to employment data for St. Louis County. The assignments of staff have produced higher representation of minority staff in the North County area. Generally, the higher representation of minority staff aligns with school districts in which students of color are higher percentages of the student population.

The district has a policy option relative to the current pattern. The higher representation of minority staff in school districts in which students of color are the majority – or at least a higher percentage of the student population compared to other school districts – allows students of color to see their adult role models in positions of authority and professionalism. Some school districts find such a staffing pattern to be effective as the staff and administration relate to the cultural, behavioral and academic needs of their students of color.

However, such a pattern of staff assignment by SSD has resulted in a much lower representation of professionals of color in majority white school districts. Some school districts have found it beneficial for staff of color to be represented in schools where students of color are in the minority. Anecdotal evidence suggests significant role models of color provide unique support for students of color and may have positive impacts on both academic and non-academic aspects of the school experience.



There is no evidence that the staffing patterns observed by this team were the result of policy directives from the Board or district administration. However, they do exist. The district may wish to determine if the current pattern meets the needs of the students and district, or if a change in the pattern would be desirable.

### **Special Education and Related Services – Policy Options and Recommendations**

1. The incidence rates for students with disabilities are higher in St. Louis County than for the state as whole. Further, the incidence rates for children and youth with disabilities vary from district to district both for ECSE and for school-age students. In some instances the variance is substantial. There is variance in the rates for specific disabilities. There are some districts that have a high incidence of poverty but a lower-than-average incidence of disabilities. Alternately, there are some districts with lower incidences of poverty but higher-than-average incidences of disability. The Board and Administration may find it beneficial to review the data reported and determine if further study and changes may be necessary.
2. The placement of students with disabilities in the Least Restrictive Environment is an important function of IEP Committees. A review of the data suggests there is considerable variance between the partner districts in the level of placement afforded to students. Some districts rely heavily on inclusive placements while others on restrictive placements. Some districts welcome students from other districts who have low incidence disabilities, while others do not. The patterns suggest the philosophy of the partner districts result in notable differences in the level of special education placements offered for students with disabilities. The Board and Administration may find it beneficial to review the placement patterns identified in this report to determine if it is appropriate and beneficial to achieve more commonality between districts with respect to placement patterns.
3. The findings regarding staffing patterns identified some variance regarding teacher/related service staffing levels and area coordinators' supervision caseloads. The Study Team did not have information regarding the level of disability of students served by the teachers nor the intensity of the programs and services to judge if variances were responsive to student needs. The Study Team is aware that a similar finding was offered by the Gibson Study. Based on the Gibson Report, the district has established a teacher and related services workload committee to develop and test a staffing model that is sensitive student needs.
4. The section of this report that details student outcomes identified several areas that the Board and Administration may wish to explore further. Of note to the Study Team was the Special Education Program Evaluation recently presented to the Board by the Administration. The results of the Program Evaluation and the observations made in this report complement one another in many respects. There are questions identified with respect to suspension, graduation and dropout data that deserve further review and analysis by the Board and Administration. Educational results as measured by the MAP and EOC examinations contained a high degree of commonality between the Special Education Program Evaluation and the data reported in this study. Of particular note were students from those districts that

consistently performed better than others; and the relationship between the MAP and EOC scores for students with and without disabilities.

The outcome data suggest another area for further study. There is a notable gap between outcome data for students with disabilities who are Caucasian and those who are students of color or those living in poverty. Notable gaps are present in most of the partner districts, even those with the highest levels of achievement. While such a gap is a national phenomenon as well, researchers and educators have begun to identify policies and practices that are proving to be more effective in addressing the educational needs for these important groups of students. The Board and Administration may wish to consider formation of specific improvement groups to investigate this area further and implementation of strategies that will improve results.

Given the expectation that students with disabilities receive special education and related services to enhance their ability to access the general education curriculum, there may be opportunities for collaborative efforts with partner districts to enhance the structure and strength of the general education curriculum and services necessary to support the learning of all students. Concepts such as Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) may be of interest to explore to strengthen the efficacy of instruction for all students, and thereby improve the instruction for students with disabilities as well. The data strongly suggest the educational results for students with disabilities are closely associated with educational results for all students in the partner district. If this is so, one group of students may not be substantially improved without improving the other.

### **Career and Technical Education – Policy Options and Recommendations**

1. The programs, offerings and enrollment procedures are highly similar at North and South Technical High Schools. When course offerings differ, the difference is a function of the enrollment of students in the different programs. If students in one catchment area desire a program that is only offered at the other school, the student is able to enroll in the other school program.

The unavailability of full-day programs at South Technical High School is one of the primary differences between the two schools. Since district policy enables students to enroll in the school outside their catchment area, the lack of full-day programs at South does not appear to be an issue of equity.

The data suggests there is a substantial difference in the enrollment of students in two programs offered at both North Tech and South Tech – Advanced Manufacturing and Career Exploration. Significantly more students enroll in Advanced Manufacturing at South Tech and significantly more students enroll in Career Exploration at North Tech. Career Exploration provides general career information and exploration, but not education and training in specific career options.

The administration may wish to conduct studies with students to determine the basis for this difference and determine if changes in career counseling and guidance in course selection may be necessary.

2. The EOC data for students at South CTE was not available because these students take their academic coursework at their home high school. If these data would be useful to SSD for program evaluation or program planning purposes, the district may wish to establish a procedure whereby the data could be

obtained from the partner districts for use by SSD.

3. Students with disabilities account for slightly more than 20% of the total enrollment in the CTE programs. In the suburban CTE programs included in the comparison charts, students with disabilities comprise slightly more than 7%. However members of the Equity Task Force expressed some dissatisfaction with the availability of CTE programs for students with disabilities. Statewide, IDEA eligibility for special education is approximately 12.6%. The availability of CTE programs for students with disabilities is a concern on a statewide basis, while in St. Louis County there appear to be almost three times the percentage in CTE programs.

While there is an over-representation of students with disabilities in the SSD programs in comparison with other suburban areas of the state, there is a demand for even more options to serve students with disabilities. The relatively lower participation of students with disabilities statewide may well be a reflection of a change in federal policy that occurred several years ago in a reauthorization of the Perkins Act. Federal funds once dedicated to special populations (students who live in poverty, students with disabilities, ESL students, etc.) were reprioritized in the federal legislation.

The administration may wish to determine if CTE programs for students with disabilities may be expanded. While federal funds may be limited and unavailable for such an expansion, the need for such programs has been expressed in the present study as well as a previous study referenced as the CTE Focus Group Study.

4. Student participation in CTE programs has been a topic of interest and study in St. Louis County for a number of years. School leaders have desired to expand the number of students participating in the CTE programs. This interest has contributed to the decision of several school districts to initiate their own CTE programs (primarily STEM programs) within their own districts. However, SSD does not have ready access to information regarding the specific programs the districts have developed nor the number of students who have enrolled. There does not appear to be an entity collecting or coordinating such information.

The administration may wish to engage in discussion with leadership in the partner districts to designate a process by which data on all such programs may be collected and information disseminated countywide. Decisions regarding further program development, sharing of program resources, enrollment options, etc., may evolve from such analysis.

### **Equity in Contracting and Purchasing – Policy Options and Recommendations**

1. The district should continue to address this issue as an administrative program rather than a formal, Board-adopted policy. As outlined in this report, district administrators must consider multiple factors when awarding contracts under competitive bids. In the event a decision was challenged alleging over-emphasis or under-emphasis of one or more of these factors, the Board would be able to review the decision and take appropriate action. This opportunity for appeal to the Board would help to minimize the possibility of potential legal action.

2. Recent efforts in the area of construction represent an excellent step toward ensuring participation by MBEs and WBEs. The district should continue to implement the Minority and Women Business Program as designed. District administrators should continue to monitor MBE/WBE participation in construction projects and develop an annual report to be submitted to the Superintendent.
3. The district should expand the Minority and Women Business Program to monitor participation of MBE/WBE vendor participation with regard to major purchases. Specifically, any purchase arrangement that is secured by contract and valued at \$100,000 or more should be subject to program conditions similar to those now applied to construction contracts.
4. As the district seeks to expand the Minority and Women Business Program in the future, whether by administrative action or Board action, it is imperative that the district utilizes and follows the advice of legal counsel.
5. When preparing bids/contracts, the district should consider breaking up large contracts into multiple, smaller contracts to the degree that is reasonable to do so. MBEs and WBEs are sometimes smaller companies with a lower capacity to bid on public contracts.
6. When preparing bid specifications, the district should carefully consider bonding requirements to ensure that these requirements are set no higher than is necessary to protect the district's interest. Lower bonding requirements will exclude fewer small MBEs and WBEs from participation.
7. The district should take steps to ensure prompt payment to contractors. Furthermore, the district should encourage prompt payment by contractors to subcontractors. Small MBEs and WBEs often cannot function without prompt payment.
8. The district should begin to maintain a list of MBE and WBE contractors and vendors in a variety of areas. In the future, the district could share this list of potential subcontractors with prime contractors to help them meet the district's MBE/WBE participation goals.
9. If the district learns of a MBE or WBE that is not properly certified as defined in the Minority and Women Business Program, the district should encourage the MBE/WBE to become certified so that it might be considered by the district in the future.