

## Coordinators

Paul Bauer, Associate Superintendent

Matthew Traughber, Evaluation and Research Administrator

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	2
Report Description .....	3
Previous Recommendations .....	4
Results	
Standard 1: Academic Achievement .....	4
Standard 2: Subgroup Achievement .....	6
Standard 3: College and Career Readiness .....	7
Standard 4: Attendance .....	8
Standard 5: Graduation Rate .....	8
Individual School APRs .....	10
Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement .....	11
Recommendations for Action .....	11
Dissemination Plan .....	11
Appendix A: Changes to the APR .....	12
Appendix B: MSIP 5 Standard Descriptions .....	14

## Executive Summary

This report informs the Board of Education and other District stakeholders of the results and implications of the prior year's Missouri School Improvement Program 5 (MSIP 5) accreditation review. The district Annual Performance Report (APR) is comprised of ratings for each of the MSIP 5 Performance Standards: (1) Academic Achievement, (2) Subgroup Achievement, (3) College and Career Readiness, (4) Attendance Rate, and (5) Graduation Rate. SSD's APR rating is based on outcomes for students who attend SSD schools and programs only. Students participating full time in career technical education (CTE) programs are included. Students provided special education services through SSD's partner districts or who attend a CTE program part time are excluded, with the exception of attendance rates for part-time CTE students.

## Key Findings

- MSIP 5 continues to be the framework for district accreditation requirements while MSIP 6 remains under development. Significant changes to APR reporting were implemented for school year 2019. The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) no longer calculates points for the overall APR or individual Standards as of 2019 (changes are noted in Appendix A). Future accountability assessment under MSIP 6 may differ substantially from the current scheme per preliminary proposals.<sup>1</sup>
- SSD maintained "Accredited" status in 2019.
- Academic Achievement standard status and progress ratings fell at the Floor level in both ELA and math content areas in 2019, and MAP Percentage Index (MPI) scores were at a 5-year low. In contrast, SSD's Academic Achievement growth metric classification has been either On Track or Exceeding annually since 2015 in both ELA and Math (growth is derived from performance of students in grades 4-8 who take the grade-level MAP assessment).
- SSD performed at the Approaching classification level on the College and Career Readiness (CCR) assessment indicator, with 42.8% of graduates scoring at or above the state standard.
- SSD performed at the Target classification level on the CCR advanced placement indicator. The percentage of graduates who earned a qualifying score on an advanced placement assessment and/or received college credit increased substantially in 2019.
- The percent of graduates with a post-secondary placement outcome that meets the DESE standard was 58.1% in 2019, declining considerably from the prior year.
- SSD earned Approaching status on the Attendance standard for the second consecutive year, and the proportional attendance rate increased in 2019. South Tech achieved the status metric Target classification for attendance.
- SSD's 7-year graduation rate was 87.9%, which is classified as On Track for the status metric. However, SSD fell at the Floor level on the status metric for 4-year, 5-year, and 6-year graduation rate. SSD is at a disadvantage with respect to the graduation rate calculations given that students who graduate based on meeting IEP goals are considered non-graduates.
- North Tech's 4-year graduation rate was 97% (achieving Target level status) in 2019.

---

<sup>1</sup> See <https://dese.mo.gov/quality-schools/mo-school-improvement-program/msip-6>.

## Description

This report informs the Board of Education and other District stakeholders of the results and implications of the prior year's Missouri School Improvement Program 5 (MSIP 5) accreditation review. SSD's Annual Performance Report (APR) rating is based on outcomes for students who attend SSD schools and programs only. Students participating full time in career technical education (CTE) programs are included. Students provided special education services through SSD's partner districts or who attend a CTE program part time are excluded, with the exception of attendance rates for part-time CTE students.

The district APR is comprised of ratings for each of the MSIP 5 Performance Standards: (1) Academic Achievement, (2) Subgroup Achievement, (3) College and Career Readiness, (4) Attendance Rate, and (5) Graduation Rate. Status, progress, and growth (in the case of achievement) metrics are reported. For each of these five standards, DESE monitors the extent to which districts meet the established state performance standard (as indicated by the status metric) and demonstrate improvement (as indicated by the progress and/or growth metrics). There were significant changes to APR calculations instituted in both 2018 and 2019; a summary of these changes appears in **Appendix A**. **Appendix B** contains detailed descriptions of APR measures and scoring guidelines.

Reporting and analysis of SSD performance on the annual APR allows for identification of District trends, accomplishments, and opportunities for improvement. It is expected that the District's continuous improvement process will address opportunities for improvement and that the District will meet criteria for maintaining accreditation per DESE standards.

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

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

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

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

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

- Current MSIP 5 accountability standards such as graduation and post-secondary outcomes are often discordant with what would be considered acceptable outcomes for many of SSD’s students with significant disabilities:
  - Acceptable post-secondary outcomes (Standard 3\*5-6) include only post-secondary education/training, military, or employment (for graduates of career education programs).
  - Students who graduate under alternate standards or by meeting IEP goals are included in the calculation of graduation rate (Standard 5), but only those who graduate with a regular high school diploma are counted as graduates. Thus a large portion of graduates of the SSD separate public high schools are considered not to meet the DESE standard.
- A sizable percentage of SSD students attend the District’s career and technical education schools. The path to a CTE school is unconventional, however, with many students first enrolling as 11<sup>th</sup> graders. SSD is thus accountable for the achievement and outcomes of these students despite having minimal influence on instruction and programming for those students prior to 11<sup>th</sup> grade.

## Recommendations From Most Recent Data Report

1. Continue to work with DESE to develop an accreditation process that holds SSD accountable and measures student performance in a manner appropriate to our students.

Status of Recommendation: District leaders have been in contact with DESE and SSD will be represented in their work groups; now waiting notification from DESE to start the process.

2. Continue professional development activities with teachers to increase their cultural proficiency in order to deliver culturally-relevant instruction.

Status of Recommendation: District schools are continuing work with the Cambio Group focused on promoting equity and increasing the cultural proficiency of staff.

3. Increase capacity of teachers to support students who have previously taken the alternative assessment and will now be assessed using grade-level assessments.

Status of Recommendation: Trainings were offered at the beginning of the year in each content area to support scaffolding, use of materials, and creating yearly plans. There is a math ‘cohort’ designed specifically for this population that provides support to teachers.

## Current Results

### Standard 1: Academic Achievement

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

Detailed Standard 1 results appear in the table below. New social studies assessments were piloted in 2019 and thus were excluded from the APR calculation. New grade-level and EOC science assessments were piloted in 2018 and administered at eligible grades in 2019. Science results were omitted from initial APR reporting.

Note that in 2017-18, new DESE requirements prompted districts to begin re-assessing alternative assessment (i.e., MAP-A) determinations based upon the finding of undesirably high participation in this test format. Re-categorizing a proportion of students from MAP-A to grade-level MAP or EOC is predicted to have the effect of reducing proficiency rates, as such students are generally more likely to perform well on the MAP-A and less likely to perform well on the standard assessment. Per DESE, for the 2018-19 APR, “In an effort to ensure comparability for status and progress, students who have consistently taken the MAP-A or who have never taken the MAP-A will be used for the calculation of standards 1 and 2 for state accountability purposes,” which indicates that students whose test eligibility

changed from MAP-A to grade-level MAP or EOC were excluded from MSIP Achievement and Subgroup Achievement standard calculations.

SSD’s 3-year status classification based on MAP Percentage Index (MPI)<sup>2</sup> fell at the “Floor” level in ELA and math.<sup>3</sup> MPIs fell to their lowest level in 5 years in ELA and math. The progress metrics also fell at the Floor level in 2019 (progress points take into account the performance of all tested students and compare change in normative scores across overlapping two-year periods; see Appendix B). In contrast, SSD’s growth (i.e., individual growth among students in grades 4-8 who take the grade-level MAP) classification has been either On Track or Exceeding since 2015 in both ELA and Math. See the annual SSD State Assessment Results Data Report for an in-depth review of state assessment performance and trends.

**Standard 1 (Academic Achievement) Results**

	2015	2016	2017 <sup>4</sup>	2018	2019
<b>English Language Arts</b>					
Annual MPI	240.9	231.9	204.0	215.8	190.9
3-yr Avg MPI			218.0	217.2	203.6
Status	Approaching	Floor	Floor	Floor	Floor
Progress	Floor	Floor	Floor	Floor	Floor
Growth	Exceeding	Exceeding	On Track	On Track	On Track
<b>Mathematics</b>					
Annual MPI	166.5	167.4	174.8	157.4	138.2
3-yr Avg MPI			169.6	166.5	156.8
Status	Floor	Floor	Floor	Floor	Floor
Progress	Floor	Floor	Floor	On Track	Floor
Growth	Exceeding	Exceeding	Exceeding	Exceeding	Exceeding
<b>Science</b>					
Annual MPI	364.2	229.5	220.1	n/a	Not yet available
3-yr Avg MPI			271.3	n/a	Not yet available
Status	Target	Approaching	Floor	n/a	Not yet available
Progress	Floor	Floor	Floor	n/a	Not yet available
<b>Social Studies<sup>5</sup></b>					
Annual MPI	300.0	330.6	341.3	321.7	n/a
3-yr Avg MPI			324.0	331.2	n/a
Status	Approaching	Approaching	Approaching	Approaching	n/a
Progress	Floor	Approaching	Exceeding	Floor	n/a

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix B for further description of the MAP Index calculation.

<sup>3</sup> Note that the achievement status targets for ELA and math were adjusted down in 2018 based on the more rigorous standards and achievement level cut-points. For example, whereas the MPI range for “Approaching” in ELA was 300.0 - 366.6 in 2017, the range for Approaching in 2018 was 251.5 - 348.8. Direct comparisons between 2018 and 2019 results and those from prior years are discouraged given the new grade-level and EOC test versions implemented in 2018.

<sup>4</sup> In 2017, a testing irregularity that invalidated the results of English II and Algebra I EOC exams. As such, the 2017 MPIs exclude high school English and Algebra EOCs from the calculation.

<sup>5</sup> Note that social studies results are based entirely on the Government EOC.

## Standard 2: Subgroup Achievement

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

DESE requires that the state assessment performance of students identified as being members of subgroups including low income,<sup>6</sup> non-white racial/ethnic background, English language learners, and students with disabilities, meets or exceeds the state standard or demonstrates required improvement. Most students served by SSD are considered to be a member of a subgroup per the DESE definition, and thus APR trends in Standard 2 generally mirror overall district achievement trends for Standard 1. Results are shown in the table below.

### Standard 2 (Subgroup Achievement) APR Results

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
<b>English Language Arts</b>					
Annual MPI	240.3	231.1	204.0	215.7	190.6
3-yr Avg MPI			225.1	216.9	203.4
Status	Approaching	Floor	Floor	Floor	Floor
Progress	Floor	Floor	Floor	Floor	Floor
Growth	On Track	On Track	On Track	On Track	On Track
<b>Mathematics</b>					
Annual MPI	166.2	167.1	174.8	157.9	137.5
3-yr Avg MPI			169.4	166.6	156.7
Status	Floor	Floor	Floor	Floor	Floor
Progress	Floor	Floor	Floor	On Track	Floor
Growth	Exceeding	Exceeding	Exceeding	Exceeding	Exceeding
<b>Science</b>					
Annual MPI	364.1	227.1	220.1	n/a	Not yet available
3-yr Avg MPI			270.4	n/a	Not yet available
Status	Target	Approaching	Floor	n/a	Not yet available
Progress	Floor	Floor	Floor	n/a	Not yet available
<b>Social Studies</b>					
Annual MPI	298.0	328.2	341.3	325.0	n/a
3-yr Avg MPI			322.5	331.5	n/a
Status	Approaching	Approaching	On Track	On Track	n/a
Progress	Floor	Approaching	Exceeding	Floor	n/a

<sup>6</sup> Free and Reduced Lunch Status (FRL) remains the sub-group indicator of poverty as it relates to the APR. DESE had initially provided, but then retracted, guidance that the indicator would change to "Direct Certification" in 2018 based on concerns regarding continued use of FRL given the Community Eligibility Provision.

### Standard 3: College and Career Readiness

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

As of 2018, CCR Indicators 1-3 and 4 exclude students who are identified as graduating by meeting IEP goals *and* as taking the alternative state assessment.<sup>7</sup> CCR outcomes for a sizable portion of students who attend SSD separate public schools will be omitted from the calculations on this basis. A description of the performance indicators that contribute to Standard 3 can be found in **Appendix B**. Results for Standard 3 are summarized below:

- Indicators 1-3 CCR Assessment: The percentage of students scoring at or above the state standard on assessments of college and career readiness (e.g., ACT, WorkKeys) was 43% (Approaching classification) and remained effectively the same in 2019.
- Indicator 4 Advanced Placement: The percentage of graduates who earned a qualifying score on an advanced placement assessment and/or received college credit increased substantially in 2019, and SSD was at the Target level for this indicator. Qualifying performance for this Indicator comes almost entirely from CTE students who take and pass a Technical Skills Assessment (TSA) or Industry Recognized Credential (IRC), and/or who earn a B or better in a dual credit course.
- Indicators 5-6 Post-Secondary Placement: The percent of all graduates with a post-secondary outcome that meets the DESE standard was 58.1% (classified as Approaching) in 2019, declining considerably from the prior year.

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

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
<b>1-3 CCR Assessments</b>					
% at or Above State Standard	49.7%	46.3%	50.3%	42.5%	42.8%
3-yr Avg			48.8%	46.2%	45.2%
Status	Approaching	Approaching	Approaching	Approaching	Approaching
Progress	Approaching	Floor	Floor	Floor	Floor
<b>4 Advanced Placement</b>					
% at or Above State Standard	50.2%	40.3%	49.4%	56.9%	74.3%
3-yr Avg			46.6%	48.7%	60.2%
Status	On Track	On Track	On Track	Target	Target
Progress	Approaching	Floor	Floor	On Track	Exceeding
<b>5-6 Post-secondary Placement</b>					
% Earning Qualifying Score	84.9%	85.0%	76.9%	76.6%	58.1%
3-yr Avg			82.3%	79.5%	70.5%
Status	On Track	On Track	On Track	Approaching	Approaching
Progress	Floor	Floor	Floor	Floor	Floor

Note. As of 2019, the APR discontinued including data on CTE Expansion.

<sup>7</sup> Students who graduate by IEP goals and take the MAP-A continue to be included in the calculation for CCR Indicators 5 and 6.

## Standard 4: Attendance

**Performance and Effectiveness Question(s) These Data Inform:** How do SSD student attendance rates compare to state targets? What is the trend in attendance over time?

The MSIP proportional attendance calculation was updated for 2018, and now grants partial credit for students whose yearly attendance percentage falls between 85% and 90% (see **Appendix A**). The proportional attendance rate improved to 81.5% in 2019, achieving the status level of Approaching for the second consecutive year. The progress metric remained at the Floor level, however (i.e., the overlapping 2-year average gain fell below the 1% difference needed for the Approaching progress classification).

### Standard 4 (Attendance) APR Results

	2016	2017	2018	2019
<b>Attendance</b>				
% Above 90%	80.6%	80.8%	80.7%	81.5%
3-yr Avg			80.7%	81.0%
Status	Floor	Floor	Approaching	Approaching
Progress	Floor	Approaching	Floor	Floor

Note. Results for 2015 using the new formula are not available.

## Standard 5: Graduation Rate

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

Starting in 2018, MSIP 5 excludes students who graduated on the basis of meeting IEP goals from the numerator of Standard 5 calculations (i.e., they are included in the calculation but counted as non-graduates). This should impact SSD's APR results for Standard 5 given its comparatively high percentage of students who graduate on the basis of alternative standards/IEP goals.

In 2019, SSD's status classification fell at the On Track level for the 7-year graduation rate but at the Floor level for 4-year, 5-year, and 6-year graduation rates. The progress metric classification was Approaching for 4-year and 7-year graduation rate, indicating an improvement in overlapping 2-year average. Though not shown in the table below, note that North Tech's 4-year graduation rate was 97% in 2019.

### Standard 5 (Graduation Rate) APR Results

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
<b>Four-Year Graduation Rate</b>					
4-Yr Rate	73.0%	72.4%	56.8%	58.3%	63.3%
3-yr Avg			67.3%	62.8%	59.5%
Status	Floor	Floor	Floor	Floor	Floor
Progress	Floor	Approaching	Floor	Floor	Approaching
<b>Five-Year Graduation Rate</b>					
5-Yr Rate	59.7%	68.1%	64.3%	53.7%	49.0%
3-yr Avg			64.0%	61.9%	55.7%
Status	Floor	Floor	Floor	Floor	Floor
Progress	Floor	Floor	Floor	Floor	Floor

<b>Six-Year Graduation Rate</b>					
6-Yr Rate	71.2%	68.3%	80.3%	71.8%	62.2%
3-yr Avg			73.3%	73.6%	71.4%
Status	Floor	Floor	Approaching	Approaching	Floor
Progress	Approaching	Floor	On Track	Floor	Floor
<b>Seven-Year Graduation Rate</b>					
7-Yr Rate	84.8%	88.9%	84.4%	91.4%	87.9%
3-yr Avg			86.0%	88.2%	87.9%
Status	On Track	On Track	On Track	On Track	On Track
Progress	Exceeding	Exceeding	Floor	Approaching	Approaching

## Individual School APRs

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

APR results for individual SSD schools are displayed in the table below. Positive trends include:

- Growth and/or progress in the Academic Achievement standard among elementary students in grades 4-8 at several schools.
- Target level performance in Standard 3\*4 (advanced placement) at North Tech.
- Target level proportional attendance at South Tech.
- Exceeding level progress in attendance at North Tech.
- On Track level post-secondary placement at North Tech.
- Target level 4-year graduation rate at North Tech.
- On Track status or progress for 7-year graduation rate across special education schools.

Trends of concern include:

- Academic achievement status ratings (across schools).
- College and career readiness assessment performance in the secondary schools.
- Post-secondary placement results for special education schools.

### Individual School APR Results for 2019

Standard	Metric	Ackerman	Litzsinger	Southview Elementary	Neuwoehner	Northview	Southview High	North Tech	South Tech
1	ELA MPI	200.9	134.4	181.3	ICS	154.1	ICS	340.5	
1	<b>ELA Status</b>	<b>Floor</b>	<b>Floor</b>	<b>Floor</b>	<b>Floor</b>	<b>Floor</b>	<b>Floor</b>	<b>Approaching</b>	
1	<i>ELA Progress</i>	<i>Floor</i>	<i>Floor</i>	<i>Approaching</i>	<i>Floor</i>	<i>Floor</i>	<i>Floor</i>	<i>Floor</i>	
1	<i>ELA Growth</i>	<i>Exceeding</i>	<i>Floor</i>	<i>Exceeding</i>					
1	Math MPI	155.6	128.1	145.8	ICS	111.1	ICS	ICS	
1	<b>Math Status</b>	<b>Floor</b>	<b>Floor</b>	<b>Floor</b>	<b>Floor</b>	<b>Floor</b>	<b>Floor</b>	<b>Floor</b>	
1	<i>Math Progress</i>	<i>Floor</i>	<i>Approaching</i>	<i>Exceeding</i>	<i>Floor</i>	<i>Floor</i>	<i>Floor</i>	<i>Floor</i>	
1	<i>Math Growth</i>	<i>Exceeding</i>	<i>On Track</i>	<i>On Track</i>					
1	Sci MPI	NYA	NYA	NYA	NYA	NYA	NYA	NYA	
1	<b>Sci Status</b>	NYA	NYA	NYA	NYA	NYA	NYA	NYA	
1	<i>Sci Progress</i>	NYA	NYA	NYA	NYA	NYA	NYA	NYA	
3*1-3	<b>CCR Assessments Status</b>				<b>Floor</b>	<b>Floor</b>	<b>ICS</b>	<b>Approaching</b>	
3*1-3	<i>CCR Assessments Progress</i>				<i>Floor</i>	<i>Floor</i>	<i>ICS</i>	<i>Floor</i>	
3*4	<b>AP Status</b>				<b>Floor</b>	<b>Floor</b>	<b>ICS</b>	<b>Target</b>	
3*4	<i>AP Progress</i>				<i>Floor</i>	<i>Floor</i>	<i>ICS</i>	<i>Exceeding</i>	
3*5-6	<b>Post Sec Status</b>				<b>Floor</b>	<b>Floor</b>	<b>Floor</b>	<b>On Track</b>	
3*5-6	<i>Post Sec Progress</i>				<i>Floor</i>	<i>Floor</i>	<i>Floor</i>	<i>Approaching</i>	
4	<b>Attend Status</b>	<b>Approaching</b>	<b>Floor</b>	<b>Floor</b>	<b>Approaching</b>	<b>Floor</b>	<b>Approaching</b>	<b>Approaching</b>	<b>Target</b>
4	<i>Attend Progress</i>	<i>Floor</i>	<i>Floor</i>	<i>Floor</i>	<i>Floor</i>	<i>On Track</i>	<i>Floor</i>	<i>Exceeding</i>	<i>Floor</i>
5	<b>4-yr Grad Status</b>				<b>Floor</b>	<b>Floor</b>	<b>Floor</b>	<b>Target</b>	
5	<i>4-yr Grad Progress</i>				<i>Floor</i>	<i>Floor</i>	<i>Exceeding</i>	<i>Floor</i>	
5	<b>7-yr Grad Status</b>				<b>Approaching</b>	<b>On Track</b>	<b>On Track</b>	<b>Target</b>	
5	<i>7-yr Grad Progress</i>				<i>On Track</i>	<i>Approaching</i>	<i>Floor</i>	<i>Floor</i>	

Note. APR metrics do for the given school do not apply where cells are grayed. New social studies assessments were piloted in 2019 and are excluded from APR calculations. Individual schools may not meet the minimum count required for a MAP/level rating in some instances. Standard 3\*5-6 ratings for Neuwoehner and Southview High were omitted from DESE reports but are presumed to fall at the Floor level.

Abbreviations: ELA = English Language Arts; Sci = Science; CCR = College and Career Readiness; AP = Advanced Placement; Post Sec = Post-secondary; Attend = Proportional Attendance; Grad = Graduation Rate; NYA = Not Yet Available; ICS = Insufficient Cell Size (i.e., cell size of 30 reportable students was not met).

## Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement

### Strengths:

- SSD maintained accredited status in 2019.
- The Academic Achievement standard growth metric classification has been either On Track or Exceeding since 2015 in both ELA and Math. Growth is derived from performance of students in grades 4-8 who take the grade-level MAP assessment.
- The percentage of graduates who earned a qualifying score on an advanced placement assessment and/or received college credit increased substantially in 2019, and SSD was at the Target level for this indicator.
- SSD earned Approaching status on the Attendance standard for the second consecutive year, and the proportional attendance rate increased in 2019.
- SSD's 7-year graduation rate was 87.9%, which is classified as On Track for the status metric.
- North Tech's 4-year graduation rate was 97% in 2019.

### Opportunities for Improvement:

- Academic Achievement standard status and progress metrics were at the Floor level in ELA and math content areas. MPIs in ELA and math were at a 5-year low.
- The percent of graduates with a post-secondary placement outcome that meets the DESE standard was 58.1% in 2019, declining considerably from the prior year.
- SSD fell at the Floor level on the status metric for 4-year, 5-year, and 6-year graduation rate. SSD is at disadvantage with respect to the graduation rate calculations given that students who graduate based on meeting IEP goals are counted as non-graduates.

## Recommendations For Action

Further analyze participation in, as well as performance on, college and career readiness assessments among students attending special education schools. Determine the extent to which existing assessment options are appropriate for these students, as well as which might be optimal given the nature of post-secondary goals.

## Dissemination Plan

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

## Appendix A

### Changes To the APR in 2019<sup>8</sup>

The 2019 Annual Performance Report will look significantly different this year. In keeping with the purpose of the APR, the changes will communicate the state's expectations; distinguish the performance of schools and districts; empower all stakeholders with information; drive improvement and innovation. The APR includes critical questions pertaining to the standards set out in MSIP 5.

The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), will also implement the following changes in the 2019 APR data:

#### Science

Updated Policy: Three years of data will be included in the calculation of the MAP Performance Index (MPI) and the progress calculation. Due to the administration of the 2018 science field tests, the calculation will include 2016, 2017 and 2019 data. In 2019, new science assessments were administered at the fifth and eighth grade level, in biology end-of-course and physical science end-of-course. As a result, DESE will release secure science data to districts and charter schools in mid-October with all public data being released in November 2019.

#### Social Studies Field Test (2019)

Updated Policy: DESE administered a field test for social studies assessments in 2019. Field tests are not designed to return data used for accountability purposes. No social studies data will be provided in 2019.

#### Selected Residential Facilities Exclusion

Applies to all Standards. Updated Policy: Pursuant to section 167.128, RSMo, DESE is prohibited from aggregating the data of students who reside in an institution for neglected or delinquent children, who reside in a court-ordered group home, an institution for neglected children or an institution for delinquent children for purposes of Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP). This provision of law became effective August 28, 2018 and will be implemented for the first time in the 2019 APR. Students who have been reported as neglected or delinquent by school districts or charter schools will be removed from *all* standards in the APR. These data will be aggregated into a single APR as required by state law. These data will be included in federal accountability as required by federal law.

Selected residential facilities include:

*Institutions for neglected children and youth* are public or private residential facilities, other than a foster home, that operates primarily for the care of children and youth who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed in the institution under applicable State law due to (1) abandonment; (2) neglect; or (3) death of their parents or guardians and have had an average length of stay in the institution of at least 30 days.

*Institutions for delinquent children and youth* are public or private residential facilities, other than a foster home, that operates primarily for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision and have had an average length of stay in the institution of at least 30 days.

#### MAP-A

Updated policy: Previously, the APR calculation utilized a 1% cap on the number of MAP-A proficient or advanced scores that were used in accountability determinations for Standard 1 Academic Achievement and Standard 2 Subgroup Achievement. The implementation of the ESSA requirement to *assess* no more than 1% of students on the alternate assessment did not create a statistically significant change in achievement data at the state level, but may have an impact at the district, charter school or school level. In an effort to ensure comparability for status and progress, students who have consistently taken the MAP-A or who have never taken the MAP-A will be used for the calculation of standards 1 and 2 for state accountability purposes. These data will be included in federal accountability as required by federal law.

---

<sup>8</sup> This section is adapted from the MSIP 5 Comprehensive Guide.

### Project Lead The Way (PLTW)

Applies to Standard 3\*4. PLTW redesigned program assessments used by the program to assess content knowledge more deeply and includes transportable skills valued by industry. As a result, PLTW has developed a new scale score, achievement levels and a conversion table to crosswalk the scoring on the prior version of the assessment. DESE has used the conversion table to crosswalk the new assessment to the scale for PLTW.

### Reporting Changes

Applies to all Standards. The MSIP 5 policy goals include the following:

- Articulate the State’s Expectations
- Distinguish the Performance of Schools and Districts
- Empower all Stakeholders
- Promote Continuous Improvement and Innovation

In order to bring the focus back to distinguishing the performance of schools and districts, several modifications are being made to the summary and supporting data pages for the 2019 APR. Building level APRs will be generated in 2019 and will display in the same fashion mentioned above. Sample reports are included in [the comprehensive guide]. The 2019 APR summary pages will not include the calculation of points or the percentage of points earned, but will include data visualizations of the district’s growth, progress and status as compared to state level data.

## Changes To the APR in 2018

### New Assessment Transition

DESE will cease the use of “Hold Harmless” (HH) as a part of the APR calculation. For the 2018 APR, if the 2018 points earned are the same or better than the 2017 Summary APR Points (*inclusive of HH, if applicable*), the 2018 APR will use the 2018 points earned, and the district/charter school will exit HH status permanently. If the 2018 points earned are less than 2017 points earned, then the 2018 Adjusted APR becomes:  $((2017 \text{ pts earned}) * (2/3)) + ((2018 \text{ pts earned}) * (1/3))$ . If a district/charter school uses the adjusted APR method for 2018, the adjustment will be available for use for the 2019 APR.

### Science Field Test

There will be no data available from the grade level and EOC field tests. The denominator for the 2018 APR will drop to 120 points for K-12 districts/charters and 60 points for K-8 districts/charters.

### College and Career Readiness

The calculation of these standards will be modified to exclude students who are coded both G03 (typically students who graduate meeting IEP goals) **and** MAP-A. These students will continue to be counted in Standard 3\*5-6 Placement. ACCUPLACER® scores will be accepted as an additional method to meet Standard 3\*1-3.

### Proportional Attendance Rate

The proportional attendance rate calculation will be modified to mirror calculations used for Standard 3. DESE will recalculate the attendance data used for the 2018 APR to reflect consistent data over time. Updated point values are shown in the table below.

Attendance Rate	Weight Applied
90.0%	1.0
87.5%	0.5
85.0%	0.25

### Graduation Rate

In order to report a consistent graduation rate for both federal and state accountability purposes, DESE will exclude students who have been reported as G03 from the four-, five-, six- and seven-year graduation rate calculations.

## Appendix B

### MSIP 5 Standard Descriptions

#### MSIP 5 Standard 1: Academic Achievement

*Explanation of MSIP 5/APR Achievement Measures and Scoring Guidelines (excerpted from the Comprehensive Guide the Missouri School Improvement Program, 2018 update)*

##### MAP Performance Index (MPI)

The MSIP/MAP Index calculation is based on individual student achievement level and used to develop scores within the Status and Progress metrics. Students are assigned an achievement score based on their achievement level for each content area test taken, as follows: Below Basic=1, Basic=3, Proficient=4, Advanced=5. Using those scores, the formula for calculating the MSIP Index for a student group, building, or district is: (Sum of Student Achievement Scores/Number of Students)\*100. The minimum MSIP/MAP Index Score is 100, and the maximum score is 500. The current MSIP 5 formula “penalizes” Below Basic scores. Per the MSIP 5 user guide, “Assigning one (1) point to the Below Basic achievement level and three (3) points for the Basic achievement level supports Missouri’s expectation of placing every child on a path towards Proficiency. The additional point spread is designed to recognize, through year-to-year improvement in the MPI, the movement of students from this least desirable achievement level.”

##### Status Metric

Status is a measurement of the school’s or LEA’s level of achievement based upon a three (3) year average of the MAP Performance Index (MPI), unless three (3) years of data are not available. The MPI is used to determine whether the LEA, school, or subgroup is meeting the 2020 target, is on track, is approaching, or is substantially not meeting (floor) the academic achievement target for English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies MAP assessments.

##### Progress Metric

The method of calculating progress varies by content area. In science and social studies, the Progress calculation measures improvement by comparing two (2) year averages of data and setting targets based on an MPI gap. In English language arts and mathematics, the Progress calculation measures improvement by comparing two (2) year averages of data and setting targets based on a Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) gap. Differentiated improvement targets are set for LEAs, schools and subgroups based on the individual group’s two (2) prior years’ achievement. See the MSIP guide for Progress levels and targets.

##### Growth Metric

Growth is the change in achievement scores for an individual student between two (2) or more points in time. While Progress measures the change in the performance of a defined group over time, Growth measures the achievement gains of individual students over time. Growth measures for MSIP 5 are determined by conducting a statistical analysis of all valid MAP score pairs from the prior three (3) years. A valid MAP score pair is a score from grades 4 through 8 with a score from the prior year and grade level.

The statistical analyses determine the relationship between outcome scores and predictor scores across all schools and districts. This relationship is used to calculate a “predicted outcome score” for each score pair. The differences between the predicted outcome scores and the observed outcome scores (the “residuals”) from all the analyzed score pairs are then analyzed to determine each LEA or school “effect” on student achievement growth. A score pair is assigned to an LEA and school when the MAP test that generated the outcome score was taken in that LEA and school, regardless of the LEA and school where the exam that generated the valid predictor score was taken. An LEA or school growth measure (an “effect estimate”) is the average of the differences between observed and predicted scores from all test pairs assigned to the school or district.

At this time, growth measures are only available for grades 4 through 8 in English language arts and mathematics. School and LEA growth measures are reported in Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) units on the APR. The state mean is, by construction, a score of 50 NCEs. LEA and school growth measures are compared to the state mean and those that are statistically different from the state mean will be noted. (Statistical significance depends on three

(3) factors – the magnitude of the difference from the state mean, the number of score pairs analyzed for the LEA or school, and the overall variability in the individual student growth measures.)

## **MSIP 5 Standard 2: Subgroup Achievement**

DESE requires that the state assessment performance of students identified as being members of subgroups including low income, non-white racial/ethnic background, English language learners, and students with disabilities, meets or exceeds the state standard or demonstrates required improvement. Most students served by SSD are considered to be a member of a subgroup per the DESE definition. Exceptions would include students who attend career/technical schools or are served through the Courts program who do not have an IEP or otherwise meet an inclusive subgroup designation. Because a large proportion of SSD students fall in a subgroup, generally APR trends in Standard 2 mirror overall district achievement trends of Standard 1.

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

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

How well the district has provided adequate post-secondary preparation for students is evaluated by the extent to which the following indicators meet the state standard or demonstrate required improvement:

1. The percent of graduates who scored at or above the state standard on any department-approved measure(s) of college and career readiness, for example, the ACT, SAT, COMPASS, or Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) (Standard 3: 1-3 - CCR Assessments);
2. The district's average composite score(s) on any department-approved measure(s) of college and career readiness, for example, the ACT®, SAT®, COMPASS®, or ASVAB.
3. The percent of graduates who participated in any department-approved measure(s) of college and career readiness, for example, the ACT®, SAT®, COMPASS®, or ASVAB.

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

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

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

5. The percent of graduates who attend post-secondary education/training or are in the military within six (6) months of graduating meets the state standard or demonstrates required improvement.
6. The percent of graduates who complete career education programs approved by the department and are placed in occupations directly related to their training, continue their education, or are in the military within six (6) months of graduating meets the state standard or demonstrates required improvement.

## **MSIP 5 Standard 4: Attendance**

DESE requires that the percentage of students who regularly attend school meets or exceeds the state standard or demonstrates improvement. Attendance targets use individual student's attendance rate and set the expectation that 90% of the students are in attendance 90% of the time. Attendance is based on proportional weights that consider the extent of the year each student was enrolled in the district. Starting in 2018, students with 85 percent attendance or greater will be proportionally weighted 0.25, and 87.5 percent attendance or greater will be proportionally weighted 0.5.

## **MSIP 5 Standard 5: Graduation Rate**

This standard requires that districts ensure students complete high school. The metric used for evaluation is the percent of students who complete an educational program at a rate that meets or exceeds the state standard or demonstrates required improvement. The *highest rate* across graduate cohort years 4, 5, 6, and 7 is what is used in the APR (inclusion of a 7-year graduation rate began in 2014). As of 2018, students who graduate by earning some or all required credits through modified classes aligned with alternate state standards or by meeting IEP goals are excluded from the numerator in the calculation.